THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The Rev. A. G. Hebert, of the Society of the Sacred Mission, Kelham, who wields a diligent pen, has written a book on *The Form of the Church* [1] which we are asked to regard as a contribution to the subject of the nature of Catholicity. By the form of the Church is meant in the first place the Church's outward order, shape and structure; and this is of two kinds. There are the essential forms (Bible, Creeds, Sacraments, Ministry), and these, says Father Hebert, are substantially of divine authority. Then there are the secondary forms (such as exegesis, theology, liturgies, church organization), which are man-produced. Of course much will turn on the significance of 'substantially' in the above sentence.

The book is in effect an exposition of the 'essential forms' of the Church as these are set forth in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, which was first put out at Chicago in 1886 by the Anglican Bishops in the United States. According to this document Christian unity is conceivable only on the basis of 'the substantial deposit of Faith and Order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world.' As inherent parts of this deposit they accounted the following, and these must be regarded as essential to the restoration of unity in Christendom.

(1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the revealed word of God.

(2) The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

(3) The two Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.

(4) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

Father Hebert is well alive to the fact that, while the first three elements of the Lambeth Quadrilateral are by no means devoid of difficulties, there is acute controversy at present as to whether the fourth element, the Episcopal Ministry, really is one of the essential forms of the Church. To this point he pays special attention, when after expounding the *notæ* or marks of unity, holiness, and catholicity he comes to that of apostolicity.

He finds there are six chief objections, each contributing a point of positive importance, to the reckoning of Episcopacy as one of the essential forms of the Church.

(1) The Apostles, in giving us the New Testament, set up a permanent norm of Christian teaching.

It is true, Father Hebert allows, that the New Testament is the canon, or standard, of Christian doctrine; but it is also true that there need to be in the Church persons responsible for the guardianship of Christian doctrine, and that this has always been recognized as belonging primarily to the episcopate.

(2) Could it not be that the Apostolic Commission, which is the essential core of the Ministry, belongs to Presbyters as well as Bishops, and that parity of Ministers is the true principle?

To this objection Father Hebert replies that, while the Threefold Ministry is not of Divine institution, the Bishop had from early times to delegate to the presbyterate the ministry necessary for the oversight of a congregation, but having his deacons as his own assistants; accordingly, the essential core of the Ministry, namely the Apostolic Commission, is held in its fullness by the Bishop alone, who is empowered to hand on.

(3) As the circumstances of St. Paul's call should remind us, what gives authority to Christian ministers is their testimony to a God who retains His Lordship over them.

But, urges Father Hebert, St. Paul's call to be an apostle was perhaps not so irregular after all. He claimed to have 'seen the Lord,' and his claim was allowed; the Lord had chosen him also.

(4) The New Testament knows only of the one Priesthood of Christ and of a priesthood of all believers, and therefore the Ministry is not a priesthood.

But, says Father Hebert, the priesthood of all Christians in no way excludes the special priesthood of the clergy. The functions of the clergy

[1] Faber & Faber; 8s. 6d. net.

and laity in the Church are complementary: as there cannot be the Church without the bishop, so there cannot be the bishop without the Church. However, the bishops, as in South Africa, should be elected by the diocese and govern with the synod.

(5) The only succession that matters is that of men who would hand on the Apostolic tradition not mechanically, but in the Spirit.

To this objection Father HEBERT says that the implied disjunction between the Form and the Spirit is an outrage. No doubt it is important to lay stress on the need of the Spirit, but why should that mean that the forms of the Apostolic Ministry are any the less important?

(6) Free Church Ministers will never be persuaded that they are not real Ministers and that they have not been 'blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit.'

But, alleges Father HEBERT, it is not possible to bracket together the ordinary Presbyterian Sunday morning service with an Anglican High Mass as two forms of religion seeking to obtain one end by different means; and it remains that the Free Church Ministries mean something different from the Catholic Ministry. No advance towards reunion is possible till we have reached some common understanding of the nature of the Ministry.

We have only been able to give an impression of Father HEBERT'S treatment of the array of objections he has tabulated—objections that are not in all cases consistent with one another; and neither the objections nor the replies may be thought to be satisfactorily stated.

But we have been able at least to call attention to the debatable thesis here propounded that the Essential Ministry, that is, the Episcopate which is descended from the Apostles, is of the *esse* of the Church; the whole layout of the Dependent Ministry falls into the secondary forms of ecclesiastical regulations—'that is, not only the paraphernalia of canons, archdeacons, and the rest, but even the division of the Dependent Ministry into priests and deacons.'

Some time ago there appeared a book, 'The Testament of Devotion,' which was at once recognized as being of unusual excellence. It manifested qualities of intellectual vigour, freshness of mind and spiritual insight which devotional books often lack. The writer, Mr. Thomas R. KELLY, shortly before his death delivered four lectures to the students of Haverford College which, after having been received with warm appreciation in America, have now been published in this country under the title of *Reality of the Spiritual World*.[1]

The aim of these lectures is twofold. In the first place to consider what grounds we have for belief in God and the spiritual world as actually existent, and in the second place to give guidance as to how we may make contact with that world, or rather, one should say, how we are to establish and maintain communion with the supreme Reality, God. We have space for notes only on the first of these topics.

If the question were put, 'How can we be sure that God is real, and not just a creation of our wishes?' various answers would be given. We have disquieting desires for a God, for a real God. 'There come to us times of loneliness when we seem to have a premonition of a deep vastness in ourselves, when the universe about us, gigantic as it is in all its starry depths, seems cramped and narrow for our souls, and something makes us long for an abiding Home. We have times of fatigue, of confusion, of exhaustion, of utter discouragement, when we long for a serene and everlasting Bosom on which to lay our heads and be at peace.' These longings have themselves been offered as some proof of the reality of the spiritual world on the ground that such longings were not created in vain, else life itself would be a futile mockery. But this line of argument seems to assume the very thing to be proved, the existence of a Creator who will fulfil the desires of every living thing.

More formal arguments have been advanced, some of them most impressive intellectually. These are sufficiently familiar to all who take an interest in the subject. The structure of the universe seems to require a creator of limitless power and wisdom, the evidences of co-ordination and design seem to point to a Great Designer; still more impressively perhaps, the voice of conscience within the soul seems to speak of a Moral Governor of the world. The cumulative weight of such evidences is undoubtedly great, but they cannot be regarded as conclusive. And, further, while they impress the intelligence they have little power to touch the heart and renew the will. As the foundation of a living faith they are found to be inadequate.

'But there is a wholly different way of being sure that God is real. It is not an intellectual proof, a reasoned sequence of thoughts. It is the

[1] Friends' House; 1s. net.

fact that men *experience* the presence of God. Into our lives come times when, all unexpectedly, He shadows over us, steals into the inner recesses of our souls, and lifts us up in a wonderful joy and peace.' To be able to defend a creed intellectually isn't enough; you must experience as reality first of all what the creed asserts. And unless the experience is there, behind it, the mere belief is not enough.

Now this experience of God authenticates itself in several ways. For one thing it 'energizes us enormously, in a way far different from arguments. Arguments that convince our intellect alone leave us merely with questions answered, but they do not bring us to our knees in humble, joyful submission into His hands of all that we are.' Then, again, this experience seems definitely to come from beyond us. It carries a sense of objectivity in its very heart. We feel that God has broken in upon our soul, that He is the active one and we are the receptive. The last thing we can believe is that the initiative has come from us. Still further, this experience generates a state of certainty about God which is utterly satisfying and convincing. 'It is not the certainty that follows a sound argument. It is different, a kind of self-guaranteeing certainty.' Sir Arthur Eddington very aptly illustrates this kind of certainty. 'In the case of our human friends we take their existence for granted, not caring whether it is proven or not. Our relationship is such that we could read philosophical arguments designed to prove the non-existence of each other, and perhaps even be convinced by them—and then laugh together over so odd a conclusion. I think there is something of the same kind of security we should seek in our relationship with God. The most flawless proof of the existence of God is no substitute for it; and if we have that relationship the most convincing disproof is turned harmlessly aside' (*Science and the Unseen World*, 43).

At the same time it should be clearly understood and frankly admitted that this mystic experience is in no sense a flawless logical proof. Mere strength of conviction does not prove reality, for hallucinations are utter certainties to the insane. Nor is the pragmatic test, which would prove the reality of the experience by its fruits, logically unassailable, for a false belief, held with passion, may work wonders. In short, no absolute certainty by logical proof is attainable. But is religion alone in this respect? By no means! The whole of science is in the same position. Scientists to-day freely admit that they cannot offer us more than probability. Science rests ultimately upon faith, not on logical certainty. And this is the ground of religion. Science holds the faith that the universe is a realm of reason, holds that faith so assuredly that any suggestion that the universe is irrational is not taken seriously. In that faith science pursues its way untroubled by the logical flaw, although, if the point be pressed, science has no logical proof to offer that the world is rational. Even so, religion rests on the faith that the universe is a realm of love. There is no logical proof of it, and much argument might be made on the subject. But the man who has had experience of God in his heart and in his life pursues his way untroubled by such arguments. His conviction is too deep-rooted to be overturned by them. Just as the scientist feels that, if the universe were irrational, it would knock the bottom out of all knowledge and make everything meaningless, so the man who has experienced the power of religion cannot but feel that if there be no God of love then the whole world is confusion and darkness, and human life futility.

Does this mean, then, that every individual's insights are final? By no means, for the result would be a state of religious anarchy, each man being the final measurer of truth. There is still room for the operation of reason in testing conflicting views, and weight must be given to the testimony of spiritually discerning souls. Especially do we find such testimony in the Scriptures. 'They are a social check upon our individual experience, not as a law book, but as a disclosure of kindred souls who have known a visitation of God. For they now seem to be singing our song, or we can sing their song, or the same song of Eternal love is sung through us all, and out into the world.'

In a very ably written book, *Studies in Christian Love*[1] Mr. Edward W. Hirst, M.A., B.Sc., D.Lit., formerly Lecturer in Christian Ethics in the University of Manchester, discusses the application of the Christian faith to different departments of life. In view of the planning for various forms of reconstruction after the war the chapter on 'Christian Love and World-Order' is of special interest. The author begins by a description of the origin of the State. It was due to sin, said Augustine. It was due to the social constitution of man, said Aristotle. Both theories may be true, for, while man's social instinct leads him to form clans, tribes, nations, these are never able to overcome the selfishness of man. Man is social, but not social enough.

In an imperfect world State government is necessary. Jesus taught this and so did St. Paul.

[1] Epworth Press; 8s. 6d. net.

But exclusiveness is a characteristic of all social organizations. The Hebrews, the Greek City States, and the Holy Roman Empire are all examples of this. As it exists everywhere the State is organized selfishness. It is based on the rule of force which in general is incompatible with the reign of love. In contrast to this the Christian conception of a world-order is a divine world-household. Jesus used the phrase 'Kingdom of God' because it was familiar. But He did not think of God as a King. His fundamental thought was the Fatherhood of God and of His people as a Brotherhood. It is probable that He did not use such an expression as the Household of Faith because the home in his day was such an imperfect thing. The status of woman was low. Marriage was an unstable affair, and home life did not present the best picture of an ideal social condition.

What then is a Christian world-order? At present the world is divided into mutually exclusive empires and states, with unequal populations and resources, unequal opportunities and conflicting aims. Any real union of such organisations seems to be impracticable, not owing to the size of the problem but simply to the lack of goodwill, or, to say the same thing, the lack of faith. For indeed a Christian world-order is one of faith; without faith in a Heavenly Father it is impossible to see humanity as a spiritual unity.

The view widely held at present is that a stable world-order can be achieved by a development of the social instinct in man. This Dr. HIRST decisively rejects. He contends that there is no hope of internationalism on a secular basis, and he examines the two forms in which such a mistaken idea has been presented. The first is the League of Nations. Its aim was to establish between the states of the world, irrespective of their ideologies, a will-organization of a co-operative kind. The modesty of its proposals bore witness alike to the difficulty of such co-operation and to the frailty of human nature.

The basal fault of the League was that it was static. It tended too much to the conservation of the *status quo*. And so far as this was true the Covenant favoured those nations which have much to gain by keeping international boundaries as they are. Moreover there was no radical attempt to achieve international justice. And, finally, the League proceeded on the assumption of the independent sovereignty of its members.

This last characteristic has led to the strong advocacy of another solution—Federation. This looks to an 'integral body in which the several States merge their independence within a specified field, definitely and deliberately sacrificing their natural sovereignty to that extent.' It is urged that justice between nations, and therefore peace, would be attained if those interests of the several peoples which affect one another intimately were placed under a common administration, such interests as colonies, trade, transport, currency, tariffs, defence, etc. As the main cause of war is economic, only political fusion between competing nations will avail as a remedy. Hence the cry, 'Federate or perish!' An example in point is furnished by the United States of America.

But this is an unfortunate example. For the original thirteen American colonies never existed as separate sovereign states. Moreover they had the same race and language. Obviously it would be a much greater task to unite in a European federation countries that differ not only in language and race but also in cultural and political traditions. For such a task human nature does not appear to have the power within itself. Instinctive sociality would be too weak to overcome the prejudices, the jealousies, above all the rooted egoism which divide states from one another.

Moreover the cost of European federation in the form of sacrifice would be great, especially to the possessive states, who would be required to share with others their advantages. And finally, the proposed measures for joint defence against disaffection and aggression emphasize the difficulties in the way of federation. And so whether the future government of peoples is conceived in terms of a league or a federation, both schemes are confronted by the same difficulty. The sacrifice of sovereignty is a final and crucial test of altruism. And it would seem evident that on secular lines there is little prospect of an international organization of high ethical quality.

How much more potent a religious influence is in this direction is evidenced by Muhammadanism which has created an Islamic brotherhood across state barriers. But the doctrine of Christian brotherhood which is implicit in belief in God as Father would, if there were sufficient Christians, have its counterpart in a political order which would be world-wide in its range and scope.

This would be a world-wide commonwealth. Territory and resources would be administered in the interest of all. What are called 'colonies' and 'dependencies' would belong, not to one power but to the commonwealth. The one principle of distribution would be equity of opportunity. The

world-wide character of the government would not threaten but would preserve and foster individualism for the operative truth would be that all are sons of God. It is true that all plans of whatever kind come up against the selfishness of human nature and only the Christian truth can supply a motive strong enough to counteract this.

Statesmen will go on making plans for a better world, relying on the social instinct and its progressive development. At the French Revolution the ideal proclaimed was 'liberty, equality, and fraternity.' But history has shown that the slogan broke down completely in its third member. No league, no federation, no scheme of human idealism will be attained by law or by planning. Fraternity is possible only on the basis of Christian faith. It may seem quixotic and unpractical to base the hope of the world on the spread of Christian truth. But *magna est veritas et prævalet.*

The New Order.

V. Biblical Principles and Social Progress.[1]

By the Very Reverend W. R. Matthews, K.C.V.O., D.D., Dean of St. Paul's.

I.

The title of this lecture brings together conceptions which belong to two different historical periods and to two different universes of discourse. The Bible is literature which comes to us out of the Ancient World and, though of course its significance transcends the limitations of time, it was written by men to whom many of our most familiar thoughts were quite unknown. The conception of social progress appears to be essentially modern. The late Professor J. B. Bury, in his book on *The Idea of Progress*, traces its origin as a dominant ideal to the period immediately preceding the French Revolution, when the Encyclopædists, rejecting the dogmas of religion and deeply impressed by the advance of natural science, found in progress a better and, as they supposed, more rational surrogate for the inspiration of religious faith. However this may be, it seems clear that the idea of progress played little part in the reflections of Greek philosophers or the mythology of the populace in Greco-Roman civilization. We must not be surprised, therefore, if we fail to discover either the phrase or the idea in the Bible. At least, whether we are surprised or not, it is not there, and no doubt one of the reasons why so many of our contemporaries do not find the Bible interesting is that it has nothing to say directly about what most deeply concerns them in their more idealistic moods.

It is worth while to reflect for a moment on the implications of the conception of social progress. Obviously, it is closely related with a view of the world which lays stress upon continuous development, upon evolution in the widest sense of that word. In a world where catastrophe was the order of the day (if the paradoxical expression may be allowed) the idea of progress could scarcely arise. Further, the notion of society which is involved in the conception is one which is largely modern. Society or societies are thought of under the category of organism. It is true that the analogy of the body as illustrating the harmony of a community is not modern; it goes back to St. Paul and Plato and beyond them; but the communities to which it was applied were relatively static—they did not live a continuous existence through long periods of time through which they might radically change. The idea of a society, persisting in its identity, but transforming itself as it lives until it becomes something quite different from what it was in the beginning, is a modern one closely connected with the biological way of looking at things. Again, I suppose that the idea of progress generally implies that the transition from a relatively inferior condition to a relatively superior one is brought about by causes of a natural order, which can be estimated even if they cannot be calculated. When social progress is presented as an ideal it is of course also implied that human intelligence and effort are determining factors in the process. This is true, I think, even when the theory is that progress is really caused by factors beyond human control, as in the philosophies of Herbert Spencer and Karl Marx. In so far as the idea of progress allied with these philosophies

[1] This article was given as a lecture at the Bible House and it has just been published as a pamphlet by The British and Foreign Bible Society. Copies may be obtained from their offices at 146 Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.4, price 3d.

functions as an ethical motive, it is by a convenient and natural inconsistency. The enthusiastic Marxist, while he is working for the dictatorship of the Proletariat, forgets the doctrines of Dialectical Materialism, which would indicate that his efforts are superfluous. There is another element in the conception of social progress which is of great importance, though it is too often ignored. The man who agitates for progress presumably knows where he wants to go ; he must, if he is a rational being, have some notion of the kind of society which he would regard as really satisfactory, or, in other words, he must have some criterion by which he can judge whether or no any given change is progress or regress. Unless this condition is fulfilled the gospel of progress sinks into the absurdity of preaching change for the sake of change. As I have said, it is here that so many enthusiasts for progress seem to be least coherent, for they fail to tell us what they mean by a good society and why they regard one kind of change as progress and another as reaction. It is precisely here that we shall find the Bible has the most to say to us.

It follows from this that, though the modern conception of social progress is not to be found in Scripture, yet some of the great Biblical principles may have the most important bearing on the meaning of progress. And first we may observe that the Bible has played an important part in preparing the way for that dynamic conception of reality which is inseparable from the progressive outlook. It has often been pointed out that the ancient Greek world had a totally different idea of the historical process from that we have inherited. Deeply rooted in the world-view of the ancient thinkers was the conception of cycles. The notion that events moved, not steadily forward, but in a circle, is not the idiosyncrasy of one school—it is shared by many. The eternal recurrence of events to us seems a fantastic and depressing theory, one which we can hardly make real to ourselves as a possible belief, but that only shows how different our presuppositions are from those of the great thinkers of antiquity. It is significant that the most notable of modern philosophical opponents of Christianity—Friedrich Nietzsche—returned to the doctrine of eternal recurrence. The Hebrew and Christian conception of history was totally different, and its opposition to the idea of cycles prepared the way for the ideal of progress.

It has been said by the late Professor Wildon Carr that St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, was the first to think out a philosophy of history and no doubt this is true, but I suggest that the way was prepared by the Hebrew Prophets. One of the most remarkable contributions of the long line of Prophets was their moral and religious interpretation of historical events. It would not be correct to say that they discovered the truth that historical events have a religious meaning, for it is a very ancient belief that the good fortune of a nation or tribe depends on the favour of the gods, but their revolutionary conception of the nature of God transformed their idea of the conditions of such favour. The righteous God demanded righteous people. Further, the prophetic view of the way in which the will of God is disclosed is radically different from that of the religion against which many of them protested. The will of Jahweh is not to be known by the magical methods of the old-fashioned seer or diviner, but by the insight of the inspired Prophet. ' Surely the Lord God will do nothing,' cries Amos, ' but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets ' (Am 3^7). Thus the Prophet had the conviction that there is a purpose of God in history, that the events of history, at least of Hebrew history, have a meaning and that is to be interpreted in terms of the call of the nation to be righteous.

It might, therefore, be said that there is, in a sense, the outline of a concept of progress in the prophetic consciousness. There is at least an idea of what would constitute a really good nation—it is one which is perfectly obedient to the will of God. It must be added, however, that the Prophets, on the whole, see no signs of progress ; they are poles apart from the modern theorists who regard progress as inevitable, for their constant lament was over the wickedness of the people and the consequences of their sin. Nor was their conception of the working of social retribution and reward analogous to the modern conception of social progress or degeneration even in its most idealistic form. To them the community was not the object of scientific or philosophical study ; it was the chosen people of Jahweh, and the determining factor in its destiny was its relation with Him. Thus to the Prophets historical events, and particularly historical catastrophes, were the direct consequences of Jahweh's will —they were His mighty acts. I am far from suggesting that the prophetic view of history is necessarily in contradiction with that which we, who live in the age of the ' scientific historian,' normally accept ; the knowledge of secondary causes does not abolish the need to seek for first causes ; but I think we must admit that the standpoint of the Prophets is radically different from that of the modern believer in progress.

As I have said, the denial of the cyclic conception of history, which the Hebrew and Christian belief about God and His relation with the world made necessary, was a prelude to the rise of the ideal of

progress, but we may go further and maintain that the religion of the Old Testament has principles of permanent validity to suggest with regard to the meaning of progress. The fundamental social faith of the Old Testament is that human life can be good and happy only when men walk in the fear of God and love Him with all their hearts and minds. I fear that to many of our contemporaries such a principle, when proposed as the basis of sociology, would appear like old-fashioned and irrelevant pietism, but one aspect at least of what the Hebrews meant can be put in terms which are patently relevant to our problems. In our modern jargon we speak of 'values' and we begin to see that beneath all the questions which demand an answer in the civilization of to-day lies the problem of values. How can we work for a good society unless we know what we mean by 'good'? How can we hope to build a harmonious national community, or a tolerable international order, unless the overwhelming majority of people are in substantial agreement about right and wrong, good and evil, and what constitutes a satisfactory human existence? I believe that the most alarming symptom of our time is precisely the absence of agreement about values. The religion of the Old Testament offers no support to the fantastic notion that belief about ultimates does not matter. To the Prophets the first step towards social welfare was to have a right knowledge of God and of what He demands —that is, that there should be agreement about values. For the greater part of the Old Testament the attention is concentrated on the chosen people and the fortunes of other nations are considered only in relation with them, but the peak of the prophetic inspiration takes a wider view and foretells a universal salvation. 'It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that my salvation may be unto the end of the earth' (Is 49^{6}). Yet here too the world salvation and the world-unity depend upon the spreading from Israel of the knowledge of God.

The fundamental conviction of the Prophets that God is righteous and requires righteousness is universally admitted to be the great contribution which they made to religion; nowhere are we more conscious of their inspiration than when they are condemning, in the name of God, the selfish luxury of the rich and the cynical disregard of justice. The first of the Prophets whose utterances have been preserved in a book, Amos, strikes the note that never ceases to resound in their words. 'I know how manifold are your transgressions and how mighty are your sins; ye that afflict the just, that take a bribe, and that turn aside the needy in the gate. . . . Seek good, and not evil, that ye may live: and so the Lord, the God of Hosts, shall be with you, as ye say. Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish judgement in the gate' (Am 5^{12-15}). This idea of social justice differs from most of those which are current to-day in that it is based upon an absolute —upon God. The society of which the Prophets think is a theocracy, and the primary reason for showing equity and mercy is that they are the will of God. In the Prophets, and indeed in the Bible as a whole (with the exception of some of the Wisdom writers), we are far away from the conception that social righteousness is good because it is expedient. The utilitarian philosophy has no real support in Scripture. Doubtless the whole of the Old Testament affirms that 'righteousness exalteth a nation' and that wickedness, oppression, and self-seeking bring punishment, but the ground for urging the need for justice is, not that it has good consequences for the nation, but simply that it is the will of God. If we attempted to translate this insight into language which would sound more familiar to some moderns, we might say that justice is required because it is founded in reality and injustice is disharmony with the deepest meaning of the world.

Once again we are brought back to the problem of values. Has the religion of the Old Testament any contribution to make to our efforts to make a new order? Surely it has. Nothing illustrates our confusion of thought more plainly than the manner in which so many cry for a just society without asking what they mean by justice or why it is good to be just. There are many also who, consciously or unconsciously, equate justice with their own interests or, more philosophically, with a vague 'higher expediency.' So long as what we really mean by justice is something of this kind, we shall be in danger of abandoning justice altogether. The 'higher expediency' can justify some very dubious proceedings, and it is not difficult to imagine circumstances in which the general good might seem to require fraud and violence even to the extent of 'liquidating' whole sections of the community. When righteousness is an absolute, when it is believed to be the law of God and of His universe, we have solid reason for the conviction that some means can never be justified by any ends, that there are some things which even the highest expediency cannot cover: to be just is not a means to anything else, it is good in itself. We shall need the voice of the Prophets, insisting that God commands righteousness for its own sake, very often in the years of confusion and creation which lie in front.

Any complete account of the principles to be

derived from the Old Testament would give much attention to the Law and the Wisdom Literature, but even to touch upon them in this lecture would involve us in discussions which would occupy the rest of our time. I must, however, add one word on the idea of law itself. It must be repeated that the Hebrew conception of the good society is that of a theocracy and, therefore, the idea of law is different from that which is common in modern democratic states. The Law, in all its parts, was for the Hebrew the law of Jahweh and its sanction is not the will of the people but the will of God. No doubt we have moved far from the standpoint of the ancient world in this respect, and we must own that we should find it difficult to regard our parliamentary politicians in the light of inspired lawgivers, like Moses, Solon, or Lycurgus. But, once more, we may perhaps discern a principle which has importance even in strangely different circumstances. The reverence for law, we all admit, is a necessary condition of social security, and the extension of the reign of law to cover international relations is the task of the next generation. If it fails, the prospect for mankind is dark indeed. I suggest that a merely utilitarian view of law tends to weaken its authority. When law is supposed to be nothing more than an adjustment of sectional interests, or the *modus vivendi* between various 'pressure groups,' it has lost its majesty. That law comes from God has still a profound meaning and importance. Not only is it the will of God that men should live together under law, the Law itself is good, in so far as it is the expression of justice, and justice, as we have seen, is based on the nature of God. Thus one who has learned the abiding truth in the Old Testament principle of law will have a two-fold attitude towards it; he will obey 'for conscience sake,' and he will have a motive, seated in his religious consciousness, for unresting reform of the Law to bring it nearer to the divine pattern.

(*To be continued.*)

Literature.

THE PROBLEM OF EZEKIEL.

The critical study of the Book of Ezekiel, which has attracted increasing attention in recent years, has now been carried a stage further by Professor William A. Irwin's important study, *The Problem of Ezekiel* (University of Chicago Press; 18s. net); and readers familiar with his chapter on Ezekiel in the revised edition of J. M. P. Smith's 'The Prophets and Their Times' (1941) will know more or less what to expect.

He begins with a brief statement of the critical problems involved; and this is followed by a useful sketch of recent attempts at a solution, so presented as to emphasize their lack of agreement. Irwin finds that this conflict of opinion is due to the absence of any reliable criteria of a sufficiently objective kind, and he thinks that he has found the means to satisfy this need and so make possible an inductive approach which leads to reasonably assured results. His first step is to turn to passages which are easily distinguishable as (*a*) oracle, and (*b*) interpretation; then, adopting a severely logical approach, he finds repeatedly that what we have in the second case is false commentary and, therefore, obviously spurious matter. In this way he rather early decides what is and what is not characteristic of Ezekiel in the matter of vocabulary, style, and point of view; and, this done, he applies his findings to a rigorous analysis of the remainder of the book, laying emphasis all along upon the redundancies and repetitions characteristic of the work, and frequently resorting to the theory of conflate recension in order to smooth them out and thus arrive at an orderly original. An important feature of his study is the use which he makes of the LXX, particularly the important papyrus No. 967.

On this approach Irwin admits as genuine some fifty-three oracles, or rather less than a quarter of the bulk of chs. 1–39. These oracles, which are reproduced in unpointed Hebrew accompanied by an English translation, are all in poetic form and almost invariably quite brief, the only prose accepted as genuine being short introductory statements which are often of a quite formal kind; and on the basis of internal evidence (for Irwin rejects all dates but that with which the book opens) these passages are then set out in what is taken to be their probable chronological order. As a result it appears that Ezekiel began his ministry in Jerusalem as a prophet of woe shortly after the year 600 B.C.; but, having survived the disasters of 597 and 586, he travelled to Babylon with the final deportation, and thereafter his oracles took on the more hopeful and encouraging note of ultimate restoration for both the Northern and the Southern Kingdom. His prophetic symbolism survives Irwin's critical test, but his supposed psychic abnormality and his reputed priestly character and interests turn out to be the creation of the various commentators and editors who from time to time have left their mark upon the book; and even the individualism for which he has been famous is his only in embryo. Irwin is careful to emphasize, however, that the spurious

matter, in particular the various forms of homiletic commentary, must not be regarded as worthless; rather, it is important for the light which it throws upon the Judaism of Palestine and the Diaspora during that obscure period from the Exile to the beginning of the Christian era, when Judaism was adopting so many of its now characteristic forms. Thus, to sum up, the Book of Ezekiel is to be regarded as the child, not the father, of Judaism (p. 335).

Enough has been said to show that Irwin's study is stimulating and provocative; and in due course it will doubtless receive the detailed critical examination which it obviously requires. Unfortunately the author raises considerable doubts as to the validity of his adopting so severely logical an approach to a work containing such highly imaginative material, when he himself says in condemning the alleged subjectivity of his predecessors: 'Little wonder, then, that their views are various; in the realm of imagination there are no guides or inhibitions'! (p. 224).

Mistakes in type are no more than may be expected under war-time conditions; but an index would have been an improvement. In conclusion, a word of appreciation may be added with respect to the timely and gracious dedication of this volume to Professor T. H. Robinson and the Old Testament scholarship of Great Britain in general.

AUBREY R. JOHNSON.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS.

In 1936 a composite work, edited by the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews, Dean of St. Paul's, appeared under the title *The Christian Faith* (Eyre & Spottiswoode). We do not appear to have reviewed it in these columns, but its recent republication in a new, revised, and enlarged edition (10s. 6d. net) provides us with a welcome opportunity of drawing attention to it.

The contributors to the first edition were Sydney Cave, J. K. Mozley, W. R. Matthews, G. S. Duncan, A. E. J. Rawlinson, N. Micklem, J. S. Whale, H. Wheeler Robinson, Edwyn Bevan, Francis Underhill, F. R. Barry, and P. Dearmer—distinguished theologians of various ecclesiastical allegiance but united by two bonds, conviction of the truth of the central affirmations of Christianity, and belief in the possibility of presenting these affirmations consistently with the best thought and scholarship of our time.

In the present edition the late Dr. Dearmer's essay on 'Christianity and Civilization' has given place to a more topical discussion of the subject by V. A. Demant; who describes the present situation as 'post-Christian,' as retaining in the democracies a real devotion to some of the ethical and social results of the Christian outlook, though having largely lost the doctrine and feeling upon which these results have been reared. Further, Dr. F. R. Barry's contribution to 'The Christian Way of Life' has given place in the present edition to F. A. Cockin's paper on the same subject, in which the strong impression is recorded that this epoch of human history in which we live is of incalculable significance for the Church, and the Church for it. (Dr. F. R. Barry could not find time to make his essay more topical.) Otherwise, there is no change in the essayists.

The present reviewer is still in search of a book on Christian Apologetics which he could wholeheartedly recommend to junior students of theology. It is a book which would offer in untechnical terms, 'in a style comprehensible to the man or woman who is accustomed to read leading articles in *The Times*,' an explanation and defence of the central affirmations of the Christian Faith; at the same time it would not join in the widespread revolt against reason which has in the course of the present century invaded Christian theology. It is just such a book that is here offered. But its composite nature and the mutual independence of the contributors are a limitation. None the less, until a unitary and wholly consistent work appears, the present reviewer will continue to recommend this work.

A book on Christian Apologetics must first explain and then defend. So we welcome the sub-title of the book under review, which runs, 'Essays in Explanation and Defence.' And we also welcome its evident appreciation of the fact that good explanation is the best defence.

W. FULTON.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

Living Education: Some Views on Education between the Wars, and its Prospects in the Future, by Mr. T. B. Shepherd, M.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press; 6s. net).

Religious Teaching in Schools: A Plea for a Revision of the Syllabus, by Mr. A. C. Toyne, M.A., Teacher of Religion at Hale's School, Exeter (Religious Education Press; 1s. 6d. net).

The first of these books deals with education as a general life-discipline. It covers the whole ground, physical training, mental, spiritual, the importance of speech, of history, of 'civics,' technical and vocational disciplines, education for leisure, teaching on sex. There is a general survey in the first chapter and then each subject is thoroughly canvassed in separate chapters. The author is a schoolmaster and the whole discussion is marked by the sound common sense which comes from a wide experience. Even so, one is from time to time inclined to set down a note of interrogation. Is it true, for example, that the officers' mess tends to have men of better physique than the privates' mess? (p. 28) I very much doubt it. Again, the writer lays a proper stress on providing good meals for children and seems to assume that this is all that is necessary. But what if you provide the best meals and cannot get the children to eat them? In the city in which I live there is an east-end school which has probably the best installation for cooking in the city. What is probably as good a dinner as could be found is provided at the cost of fourpence. But the children, many of them, will not look at

it. What they want is tea and 'fry.' The problem goes further back than the school.

The chapter on Religious Education is sound and deals for the most part with problems that are peculiar to England, the relation of State schools to Voluntary schools, for example, and the question of tests. The writer has not room to discuss the detailed view which we find in Mr. Toyne's book. The latter deals with three definite points: (1) What are we to teach? (2) How is this to be taught? and (3) Who is to teach it? The first raises what is certainly an important matter: Facts or truth? Mr. Toyne goes all out for truth, the Christian way of life. He groans under recollection of the Kings of Israel and Judah. Why these poor men should have become a proverbial infliction on some educationists is distressing to think of. However, they are a kind of symbol of one side of this perennial controversy. I would certainly side with Mr. Toyne if the challenge were as acute as he makes out. But is there not a compromise possible? Certainly the thing to be done is to teach the truth and the teacher who is satisfied (as so many are) with giving the facts and no more is wrong. But can we not in most cases teach the truth through the facts? And is it not necessary that children should 'know their Bible?' We want the children to know and love Jesus Christ, but is it not necessary that they should have a clear view of His life and its background?

With this is bound up the question of Scripture examinations. Here again I am with Mr. Toyne, with a qualification. I would abolish examinations on facts provided some way were found of ensuring that teachers really and conscientiously did their job. The examination has been a test rather of the teacher than of the pupil, and some sort of test of the teacher's work is essential, and the more I knew of this the more essential I have held it to be.

The religious lesson is regarded by all Christian teachers not only as the most important lesson in the school day but as the most interesting and rewarding. It is essential therefore that teachers should be thoroughly furnished for this work and that their own religious training should be part of the preparation for their career. If we could convince authority that this is the fundamental thing, that education is the development of personality and that the root of personality is spiritual, a 'religious instinct' or whatever else you call it, and that this lies behind morality, citizenship, culture, and everything else, we would take a big step towards a 'new world' and a better one.

F. J. Rae.

The latest 'Swarthmore Lecture' was given by Mr. W. Russell Brain, D.M., F.R.C.P., and the subject is *Man, Society and Religion*, an essay in Bridge-Building (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net). These lectures are meant to expound the message and work of the Society of Friends. The name 'Swarthmore' was chosen in memory of the home of Margaret Fox who had been a source of help and sympathy to many. So far as we have read them these lectures maintain a high standard of ability and also manage to be surprisingly various in their treatment of a common theme. This latest example is no exception. It is an extensive treatment of its subject from an unusual angle. The subject is the relation of man to society and the unusual angle is that it is all discussed from the point of view of psychology. Dr. Brain says that the Society of Friends has always believed that right human relations depend on the relation of man to God, but he claims that so far as religion is true and psychology scientific there can be no conflict between them, because they will both be describing the same reality. The line Dr. Brain takes may be seen from the titles of his chapters: Members One of Another; Altruism and Love; The Meaning of Social Security; Towards a New International Order; The Individual and the Group in the Religious Society; Diagnosis of our Time; The Inner Light in the Modern World. It will be apparent that the book furnishes a discussion of the relations of man to society in the light of religion, and it may be said that this is done with competence and always with interest and conviction.

The Crisis of the Western World (Allen & Unwin: 2s. 6d. net) is a reprint of six broadcast talks by the Archbishop of Canterbury and other eminent churchmen, with an Introduction by the Master of Balliol. These talks deal in general with the spiritual significance of the war as an attack on Christian freedom and the foundations, ethical and religious, of our whole civilization. Here are many excellent things said in a plain and informative way on themes which are to-day the subject of incessant discussion and which need to be emphasized and driven home to the public mind.

God's Book Shelf, by Mr. Alexander K. Handasyde (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net), is a book about the Bible, or rather about what is in the Bible. It goes through the story from beginning to end, telling what happened, why it happened, what the significance of it all is, what books appeared and why, in fact explaining all about the growing progressive revelation of God. It is very interestingly done, with a light hand, with reverence but not with dull traditionalism. Professor G. H. C. Macgregor pays a well-deserved tribute to the book, which should be a suitable gift for young people and would be an education for many not so young.

Mr. H. L. Gee has written a charming little book, *Easter at Epworth* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). It is the story of a pilgrimage which the writer made to John Wesley's birthplace, and his descriptions of the place, of the old Church and Rectory and of the Wesley Memorial Church are very vivid and interesting. But besides this he has used a fine imagination in recreating the Epworth of Wesley's day and in giving a clear outline picture of the great evangelist himself.

Many besides Wesleyans will desire to read and treasure this little gem. It may be added that all profits from the sale of the book go to an endowment fund for the Wesley Memorial Church.

A book full of interest and stimulus has been written by the Rev. Sidney M. Berry, M.A., D.D. —*The Great Issue* (Independent Press; 4s. 6d. net). The sub-title is 'Other War-Time Studies' and the fifty-two chapters were contributed to 'The Sunday Times' as weekly 'sermonettes.' It is a feat to state and enforce great themes within five hundred words, or less than two pages of an ordinary-sized book; but Dr. Berry has achieved this, and he has contrived to be both interesting and stimulating. Here are suggestions for sermons that can be used without any charge of plagiarism. The subjects are such as these: The Great Issue; The Soul of Prayer; The Unseen Guide; Faith and Temperament; The Message of Comfort; The Issues of Immortality; The Living Christ.

The Inadequacy of Non-Christian Religion (Inter-Varsity Fellowship; 1s. 6d. net) is, as the title would suggest, critical rather than appreciative of the various non-Christian religions discussed. These are Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Shinto, Animism, and Judaism. The papers 'were written for the most part on the Mission Field by men who make no claim to be authorities in the science of Comparative Religion, but who have the first essentials of writers on such subjects—actual residence in the country concerned, knowledge of the vernacular, and direct contact with non-Christian peoples.' Consequently anyone wishing to have a brief account of what these religions mean to the ordinary worshipper will find these papers both interesting and instructive. The concluding paper on 'Christianity—Supreme and Unique'—is a weighty presentation of the gospel and an impassioned plea for missionary effort.

The Beginnings of the Way (Lutterworth Press; 4s. net) is an interesting edition of Luke's Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. The name of the editor is not given but he has done his work admirably. The translation 'follows almost entirely Mr. Mercer Wilson's recent edition of the New Testament entitled "The Book of Books," using the latest knowledge we have of the Aramaic dialect of Palestine.' Brief notes give references to the Old Testament and simple explanations where these seem to be required. The book is evidently planned to catch the attention of readers to whom the world of the Bible is a strange land. The whole get up of the book makes it most attractive and readable.

Solon very prudently refused to call any man happy till he was dead, and it is certainly a risky thing for a Christian preacher to pronounce on the character and policy of men who are still in the thick of the hurly-burly and whose achievements wait the final verdict of history. In *Men of Destiny* (Scottish Colportage Society; 1s. 3d.) the Rev. James N. Dick, M.A., has attempted this task, and executed it in a judicious and helpful way, so far as is possible in brief talks. The leaders spoken of are Stalin, Chiang Kai Shek, Gandhi, Smuts, Roosevelt, and Churchill, with a brief epilogue on Behold the Man. The attractiveness of the booklet is greatly enhanced by admirable cartoons from the clever pencil of Tom Curr.

It is perhaps timely, when casualties in the world-war are fearfully mounting up and multitudes of the bereaved are looking for consolation from any quarter, that there should be a fresh consideration of the claims of Spiritualism from the Christian point of view. This has been given in *Spiritualism and Religion*, by Mr. G. W. Butterworth, Litt.D. (S.P.C.K.; 9s. net). The book is a solid piece of work showing scholarship, fair-mindedness, and a certain sympathy with some of the claims made by spiritualists. It deals at considerable length with the spiritualistic interpretation of the Bible and the theology of Spiritualism, such as it is. It is frankly acknowledged, and indeed emphasized that 'we have here a residuum of queer happenings, completely outside the run of familiar things which man has found it easy to classify under a few natural laws'; also that 'it is as certain as anything well can be that a good medium can dive into pools of knowledge extending far beyond the sitter's mind.' But the explanation of these phenomena as due to the action of discarnate spirits is gravely questioned, while the triviality of the information given, and the quality of spirit life as thus revealed, give a picture of the unseen world in the highest degree unattractive and poles asunder from the blessedness of the Christian hope.

Per Ardua ad Astra, by the Rev. Gordon Blacktop, R.A.F. (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net), contains a series of two dozen brief sermons to airmen. These sermons are sensible, manly talks with a fair sprinkling of apt illustrations. The titles are suggestive and the book should prove helpful not only to chaplains but to preachers generally. It may be true that only preachers read books of sermons, but any layman into whose hands this book may come will find in it much of interest and profit.

Religious Equality in Modern England, 1714–1914 (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net), by Mr. William George Addison, is a useful contribution within its self-imposed limits to the subject of the growth of religious toleration and its counterpart, religious equality. The book covers much and varied ground, and has to do so quickly. But Mr. Addison has been able to dwell in a very satisfying way upon the movements towards religious equality in the Gladstonian era, which may be regarded as running from Canning to Campbell-Bannerman. The era of the Liberalist tradition forms indeed the main section of his book. In that era, as he suggests, lies perhaps the explanation why French Canadian Catholics, 'governed

by Anglo-Protestants,' were yet willing to hazard their lives at Dieppe. 'The gradual abolition of religious disabilities during the nineteenth century is seen to be one of those large legislative processes which demonstrate that equity and charity alone can promote brotherly union and concord in a Commonwealth comprising men of diverse races, creeds, and traditions.' We should add that this is an able and scholarly as well as useful work; nor are we inclined to gainsay its author's declaration that with the defeat of the present great challenge to freedom 'the fundamental articles of the Gladstonian creed will become the foundational ethical principles of other Commonwealths and Constitutions' besides the British.

Mr. Robert Walton, Schools Secretary of the Student Christian Movement, has written a brief account of the Christian faith—*What Do Christians really Believe?* (S.C.M.; 1s. net). It is done, as we might expect, very well. But why say so little of the Christian faith in a future life. We may excuse the absence of anything about the Holy Trinity, though that is part of the Christian faith. But the future life is, at all times but especially now when so many people are wistfully asking: What kind of life have our beloved gone to? an urgent matter, and it is disconcerting to read so little about this hope. However, what is given us is certainly the heart of the matter, and belief in God, in His revelation, in Christ, in the Church and Sacraments are all expounded very simply and, within the limits of space, adequately. The moderate price of this booklet and its competent setting forth of essential truth should give it a wide circulation.

In an interesting book, *The Clue to Pascal* (S.C.M.; 6s. net), the writer, M. Emile Cailliet, Professor of French Literature in the University of Pennsylvania, contends that the secret of everything in Pascal is the Bible. He writes of 'the tremendous part the Bible played in the life and work of one of the profoundest thinkers of all time and one of the greatest men of God who ever lived.' Pascal, as a man of science, was an inventive genius, the barometer and the calculating machine being two of his works. Of Pascal generally Professor Cailliet holds that he is the only man whom France can pit against Shakespeare. But here he is concerned with him as a religious genius. Many people know little of Pascal except that he was the author of the saying: 'The heart has its reasons which the reason knows nothing of.' Professor Cailliet adds to this one fully as suggestive: 'Console thyself. Thou wouldst not be seeking me, if thou hadst not already found me . . . Thy conversion, 'tis my concern.' This was the 'voice' that came to him when he was deeply perplexed about the problem of election. Pascal lived and died an ardent Roman Catholic, yet his thinking (as *e.g.* in the *Pensées*) is Biblical and evangelical. This is made plain to us in a memoir that is really a spiritual biography. Professor Cailliet's closing words, though a trifle obscure, sum up the paradoxical character of Pascal's religious history: 'Let the most strictly evangelical Protestants measure with a glance the abyss which separates them from the most holy, most intelligent, the least scholastic, and the most audacious Catholic student of the Bible, and the most reverend before the sacred Word who ever lived under God's great sky. Never was a Roman Catholic nearer Evangelical Protestantism, nor farther away. In this supreme antinomy is summed up for us the secret of Pascal and of his anguish.'

Prolegomena to Ezekiel xl.–xlviii.

By Cameron Mackay, Glasgow.

Twenty odd years ago, when the writer drew attention to a fundamental misunderstanding of Ezk 40–48 affecting the modern concept of Israelite history,[1] it was permissible to treat the vision as a unity dated to 572 B.C. In the interval the book has suffered many things of many physicians. In 1933 Oesterley noted that 'the variety of opinions'—ranging from James Smith's eighth-seventh century origin to Torrey's third—'induces a sense of bewilderment.' More recent opinion, as represented in the commentaries of Bertholet (1936) and Cooke (1936), and in Lods's view that the book is authentic and only slightly worked over,[2] favours the traditional source: in particular, the final vision, denied to the prophet by Hölscher (1924) and Herntrich (1932), is by Bertholet attributed mainly, and by Cooke largely, to Ezekiel, while Lods cannot allow 'that this, the most important part of the book of Ezekiel, is, either wholly or mainly, the work of one of his disciples.'[2]

Nevertheless an open door is left for redactorial activity, and to-day, while we wait agreement on the authentic passages, if any[3]—a consummation

[1] *Princeton Theological Review*, July and October 1922, with Lofthouse's criticism in Expository Times, February 1923, and reply in July 1923.

[2] *Prophets* (1937), 8, 213 f., 225.

[3] Cf. *Companion to Bible* (ed. Manson, 1939), 301, 333, 423 f.—*tot homines, tot sententiae.*

which seems unpredictable unless in return to orthodoxy—it is advisable to premise merely that these chapters were bequeathed to our Bible by some Hebrew or Hebrews of normal intelligence. Even that may be questioned, since it can be integral to the scientific reconstruction of the Old Testament to assume that a hand here engaged in plotting, or polishing up, the heavenly Jerusalem was careless that the 50-mile specification of one verse had become eight in the following. But reliance on theological indifference to arithmetic makes a shaky foundation for science; and the present purpose is to insist that, whatever the vision's provenance, such understanding of attitude to brass tacks 'down in Judee' cannot proffer the last word on history there.

The verses alluded to embody the first and main problem of the vision's land measurements—whether the unit is cubits or reeds,[1] and consequently whether the concept of city and sanctuary is provincial or supranational. 48^{8} states that the square reservation enclosing temple and city is to lie 'by the border of Judah, from the east side unto the west side . . . in length as one of the portions, from the east side unto the west side,' and 48^{9} that it 'shall be five and twenty thousand in length.' Supporters of the cubit theory, which makes the 25,000 roughly eight miles, see here not only different hands at work but minds at variance.[2] On the other hand, if the 25,000 be reeds or six times as long, the dimension suits the east-west extent of the tribal portions.

Against the straightforward deduction from these verses the *International Critical Commentary* (G. A. Cooke, 1936) urges that the measurements of the city, 4500 square, 'must be in cubits' (p. 495). If the design was merely for a Palestinian capital the point has force. But if the conception was of 'the joy of the whole earth . . . the city of the great King,' superseder of 13-mile-square Babylon,[3] the balance tips in favour of a 9-mile-square city as against one a thirty-sixth of that size. And on the alleged obligatoriness of cubits here it is noteworthy that R.V. inserts 'reeds' more often of the city (48^{30-35}) than elsewhere in the land measurements.

The case for cubits rests ultimately on the correctness of the LXX of 42^{15-20} where the reed-thick wall protecting the temple-complex of 500 cubits square is said itself to be 500 cubits square on the outside, whereas the Massoretic text makes it 500 reeds; thence the unit is supplied for the 'five hundred' which occurs in 45^{2} among unitless land measurements, and so for the whole series. But even if the LXX be correct it is still permissible (as, incidentally, the Bagster translation does in $45^{1f.}$ 48^{8}) to understand reeds in the land measurements on the grounds that (*a*) two units are introduced at the start (40^{5-7}), but unless the land measurements are in reeds the larger unit is superfluous, being used only in nine measurements each of one reed; (*b*) the final redaction of the plan, as already pointed out, leaves standing a definition of 25,000 units as equivalent to the east-west extent of Palestine; (*c*) the series of unitless land measurements is interrupted in 45^{2} by one of 'fifty cubits': if all were in cubits it was unnecessary to specify the unit in this one instance, while if the others were in reeds a distance involving a fraction of a reed was necessarily so stated.

But does the LXX of 42^{15-20} represent the original intention? Cooke (*ICC*, p. xliv.) lists 27 instances from 40–48 where LXX 'alters Massoretic text, or makes changes, to suit the translators' view'; and, considering the disproportion between a mile-square wall and the Moriah site, here may be a further instance. Moreover, since the temple-complex sums up to a 500-cubit square, the LXX translators could have felt justified in treating a Hebrew 'reeds' as erroneous. Nevertheless inclusion of the reed-thick wall in the 500-cubit square is not so practicable as may superficially appear:

(*a*) Though the gateways on east, north, and south sides, each with threshold one reed broad ($40^{6.\ 21.\ 24}$), permit the wall's introduction, the east-west measurement of 500 cubits ends in an outbuilding 70 cubits wide with walls five cubits thick (41^{12}), so that the six-cubit wall can be brought in here only by making the outbuilding's total specification, not 80, as essential, but 81. 'There is a slight discrepancy here,' *ICC* observes, making its sum first 80, then 81, 'which need not be pressed' (p. 449); and accordingly the grand total of 500 square is announced without east-west components, though the north-south measurements are given seriatim (p. 459).

(*b*) The Hebrew uses *binyan*, 'building,' for both enclosing wall (40^{5}) and outbuilding (41^{12-15}),[4] so that if the two structures intermingle, as against being 1244 cubits apart, it is doubtful which *binyan* is meant in $42^{1.\ 5.}$ and ^{10}. Actually commentators understand *binyan* in $42^{1.\ 10}$, but not in $v.^{5}$, of the wall: on the other hand LXX has προτείχισμα in 40^{5}, but διορίζον alike in 41^{12-15} and $42^{1.\ 10}$. It can be inferred that the Hebrew writer saw no risk of the confusion which the LXX had to avoid.

[1] The Ezekielian cubit is the large cubit or 'cubit and an handbreadth,' and the reed=6 large cubits (40^{5}). For rough calculation 500 reeds=1 mile.

[2] According to *ICC* the reservation in 48^{8} 'stretches from the Jordan to the Mediterranean,' and in $v.^{9}$ 'does not stretch from the Jordan to the Mediterranean.'

[3] *Herodotus* i., 178.

[4] *binyan* thrice, *binya* once ($v.^{13}$, *hap. leg.*).

(*c*) The outer court being seven steps above the ground ($40^{22.\ 26}$), the wall's interior height, following LXX which makes a step roughly one foot (40^{49} 41^{8}), would be about four feet, thus leaving exposed the occupants and contents of the various apartments—30 chambers (40^{17}), four kitchens (46^{21-24}), and the outbuilding—whereof for the major part of its circuit this parapet must serve as outside wall.

The difficulty of getting the wall into the temple-complex is at least equalled by the difficulty of dispensing with its separate presence—and if separate from the 500-cubit square its 500 must be reeds. A four-foot parapet as sole protection of the temple's privacy means that the outer court would be overlooked from the residences of the priests' families 50 cubits away (44^{22} $45^{2.\ 4}$), this as culmination of a land plan dominated by anxiety for the temple's sanctity. And at the prophet's entrance and exit a certain deliberate blindness is required to avoid seeing a separate wall. When he reached 'as it were the frame of a city,' the guide 'stood in the gate,' demonstrated the wall's dimensions (and the gateway was the place to view the thickness of an 11-foot-high wall), and 'then came he unto the gate' of the outer court on the east, later, in relation to the other gates of the outer court, called 'the first gate' (40^{21}): where is the pre-first gate if there is no separate wall? Then at his exit the prophet was brought through the northern outer gate and 'back by the way outside to the outside gate by the way which lieth eastward' (47^{2}); 'outside,' *chuts*, is not found of outer court or gates (*chitson*, 44^{1}, etc.)—and where is the eastward way if the prophet merely rounded the temple's north-east corner?

Incidental confirmation of the wall's separation is found in the allusion to 'the frame of a city' (40^{2}), in the use of *chomah* for the wall of 40^{5} and 42^{20} but not in the description of the temple proper, and in the fact that while the 500-square enclosure is termed 'holy' in 45^{2} (see R.V. and cf. 42^{20}), in the next verse the sanctuary is termed 'most holy'—for though holiness can have a totally relative sense in Ezekielian usage, it is still against that usage to apply differentiated terms in one context to an identical locale.

Lest argument on dream-architecture 2500 years old seem unworthy of up-to-date theology, it may be advisable to emphasize that because of 2500 years' disinclination to' wrestle with those intricacies, theologians of weight in more rarefied atmosphere have been able by airily positing cubits as maximum unit to write off the land plan as a nebulous conception shading off from one clearly focused point, the restored temple on Moriah, and so to use these chapters as ground for an hypothesis of Israelite history which demands the absorption of exilic and post-exilic priesthood in the centralization of worship at Jerusalem: in their own words Ezk 40–48 has become 'the key of the Old Testament' (J. Orth, Smend, Wellhausen), 'the Archimedean point' from which the history of worship and literature in Israel has been lifted off its hinges (Delitzsch). The hard facts challenging professed desire for truth at all costs are that, between the Damascus vicinity and the Wady el Arish, a 50-mile square has to be placed with the territory on its north in proportion to that on its south as seven is to (at least) five, that within that square the temple stands north from a nine-mile-square city, and so the design is feasible and intelligible only if its city incorporates the one place whereat a devout Jew could have conceived of a city of God, while in consonance its temple, requiring, as commentators freely grant, the central position in the land plan, stands many miles north of Zion. The Ezekielian witness is thus against the preoccupation of priests of the period with the continuity of worship at Jerusalem, and, so far from buttressing the idea that they arrogated the authority of Moses for a Moriah ritual codified in their own day, indicates recognition that the central sanctuary of the Pentateuch, Shechem at the foot of Mount Ebal (cf. 40^{2}) and at the centre of the land, is, despite Jewish-Samaritan animosity, the ideal sanctuary.[1] Ezk 40–48 appears thus, not as a step towards a post-exilic Pentateuch framed in Jerusalem's interests, but as a development from a pre-Jerusalemite Pentateuch.

Attempt to avoid this conclusion by placing the temple in close conjunction with the city of the plan cannot be sustained. In 48 the portions' order goes from north to south, and the priests' or sanctuary portion is separated from the city by the 20 miles of the Levites' portion. Against the intimation of the order: Judah—priests—Levites—city—prince—Benjamin, *ICC* can only say, 'Further—a small point—in *vv.*$^{1-8.\ 23-29}$ the order goes from N. to S., whereas in *vv.*$^{10-13}$ it goes from S. to N., the priests being mentioned before the Levites' (pp. 533 f.)—the source of this revelation being Hölscher, whose methods, *ICC* earlier states, 'empty the Book of all serious value' (p. xxi.). A more calculated approach to the question has found ground for transference

[1] *Church Quarterly Review*, cxix. 175 ff. Ezekiel's temple site can 'be nothing else but Sichem or Mount Garizim.'—M. Gaster, *Samaritans* (1925), 15: and so J. Smith, *Book of Prophet Ezekiel* (1931), 66 ff. It 'would be 20 or 30 miles north of the present site, and (tace) in Samaritan territory.'—W. M. Christie, in *British Weekly*, 8th October 1936. Cf. Peake's *Commentary Supplement* (1936), 13, 'moved further north.' So Peake.

in the statement that the sanctuary is 'in the midst' of the oblation or 50-mile square (*v.*[8]); but as it is also 'in the midst' of the priests' portion (*v.*[10]), whose centre cannot on any positioning be less than 2500 units from the oblation's centre, 'midst' (תוך) must be loosely construed: it occurs, in fact, 116 times in Ezekiel and can be given no more definite implication of position than 'within' or 'among' possesses.

On the other hand, the fact that 'midst' connotes an interior position decides against the Levites occupying the northernmost place in the square. The prince's territory commences at the north border of the oblation and encloses it on east, south, and west (45[7] 48[21]); hence, while on an east-west view the holy oblation is 'in the midst' of the prince's land (48[21]), on a north-south view not the holy oblation (*i.e.* priests' and Levites' portions) but the Levites and city are 'in the midst of that which is the prince's between the border of Judah and the border of Benjamin' (*v.*[22]): the Levites therefore do not adjoin Judah.

Finally, the oblation with its 'most holy' portion for priests (*v.*[12]), 'holy' portion for Levites (*v.*[14]), and 'common' city for the people bears such relation to tabernacle or temple with most holy place, holy place, and court for the congregation as to make it reckless to enter on study of the Ezekielian conception with presumption that the order of 48 is not homogeneous.

The 'Archimedean point' of the higher criticism is thus something of an Achillean heel. No doubt it is possible still to assume that Jerusalem is the Ezekielian temple-site by writing off as addition or corruption everything contradictory—the same method as has been successful with Deuteronomy's declaration that the central sanctuary is Mount Ebal. But in Ezekiel the procedure is so wholesale as to reduce the concluding vision to a patchwork of warring ideas. When the alternative is a consistent plan with a world-capital at Zion, when that plan comes to us with the same credentials as the temple-plan before whose architect every commentator sits as a pupil, and when the carefully delineated boundaries show the dimensions of Palestine a primary consideration, then an hypothesis based on oblivion to, or contempt of, that alternative must be held ill-based, and the minds which conceived it unworthy of deference.

If there is no reason for impugning the vision's unity, neither, in view of the book's previous sympathy with Samaria and Joseph, is there support here for separate authorship. Whether, following Smith, we explain the book's impartiality on Northern Israel by a Northern source depends on how far we see Ezekiel as creature of environment: even so the facts remain that David's line is to be restored while the carcases of the Northern kings are regarded as defiling the sanctuary (43[7ff.]), that the most holy portion neighbours Judah, the only tribe to touch the oblation, and that the enlarged 'city of David'[1] decidedly gathers round Messianic Bethlehem. (Must we suspect an early Christian hand here?) An oblation which unites not only ancient Ephraim and Judah, but Abraham and the Christ, embodies an outlook wherein the North-South quarrel is transcended and forgotten.

The prophet is indeed not only 'a Pan-Israelite of the purest water' (Kraetzschmar) but notably cosmopolitan. The Babylonian theophany which attended his trance-homecomings discloses no local deity but the Lord of the cosmos, arbiter of all history. His sanctuary, at the Canaanite 'Mountain of the World,' 'navel of the earth' (38[12], Jg 9[37]; cf. Jn 4[42]), and Salem of Melchizedek, has for symbol the palm tree, unknown to the Law, but familiar among the nations as signifying 'new life';[2] and this inheritance 'all fowl of every wing' shall share (17[23]), strangers as the homeborn (47[22]). His metropolis claims the presence of earth's Lord, the 'man' who has left his sapphire throne.[3] In treating this nuncio of the universal as a politico-religious opportunist the Teutonic hypothesis of Hebrew history has possibly committed the blunder of its career. To the last major prophet laying down his pen is ascribable overmastering concern with the 'restitution of all things' expected since prophecy began. His ritual cannot stand as attempt to preserve any existing cultus: with its absence of unhewn altar, ark, high priest, and passover meal, with its Melchizedek priests who eat the propitiation for their own offence (44[27ff.]), it presents itself as step, not towards, but above the Mosaic ritual[4]—in which case it will be hard to find provenance for the latter after Moses. If the vision is not to be acknowledged a synthesis of world-hopes leaving the Law a school primer, the onus is on the materialist, German-born view of proving, imprimis, the absence of separate wall round the temple.

[1] Cf. 2 S 5[7] with Lk 2[11].

[2] 'The Sign of the Palm Tree,' in *CQR*, cxxvi. 187 ff.

[3] 1[27] with 8[2]; 43[3. 6]. 'The throne is empty.'—*ICC* on 10[1].

[4] 'The Key of the Old Testament,' in *CQR*, cxix. 173 ff.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

'Mr. Echo.'

By the Reverend R. C. Broughton, B.D., R.A.F., V.R.

Have you yet discovered how fascinating echoes can be? No doubt you know some place near woods, or rocks, or buildings where Mr. Echo delights to tease you when you shout at him. Perhaps at first you were a little afraid of him, but when your father or teacher explained who and what he was, you enjoyed shouting funny names at him.

I can remember once catching Mr. Echo in fine form. We were sailing round the Isle of Man. As we passed the rocks and caves on the south side of that tiny island, the ship's captain suddenly sounded his siren. The result was startling. For several minutes afterwards we could hear the noise echoing and re-echoing amongst the rocks. Even on that sunny day I felt a little shiver creep down my spine.

More recently I have been reading of other interesting feats performed by Mr. Echo. Near Killarney's lakes and fells is a place where they will still tell you that the ghost of a dead musician will accompany you if you play a bugle there. True enough, if you do so, you will hear a ghostly bugler playing an octave higher than yourself. It sounds rather 'spooky,' doesn't it? Actually it is Mr. Echo playing one of his many pranks. Somehow he manages to return the notes an octave higher than played.

Also, I read that he is very busy on the Saddleback Mountain in Maine. There he actually changes the nature of the sound. So that if you make a horrible yell, like an Indian war-cry, the echo comes floating back, soft and beautiful. On the whole I think we must agree that Mr. Echo is rather a marvellous gentleman.

But what is more marvellous still is the fact that we too play the part of Mr. Echo quite often. Every day of our lives we send out echoes, both by what we *say* and by what we *are*. This is always happening, and the echoes of life keep sounding on and on. Some of them even reach as far as Eternity.

Sometimes the echoes are unpleasant, like the one I heard amid the rocks of the Isle of Man. Such echoes are made whenever someone does us a wrong and we try to 'get our own back.' It is returning evil for evil. But Jesus wants us to be a much better Mr. Echo than that.

Other echoes can be sweet and lovely, like those around Killarney. This happens whenever you pass on a kindness which has been shown to you. Every one of you will love the story of David, the shepherd lad, and how he was befriended by Jonathan, the king's son. David had to wait a long time before he could repay this kindness, but years later the chance came. Jonathan had perished in battle, and there was no one to care for his crippled son. Then David played the part of Mr. Echo really well. He remembered the kindness of Jonathan by looking after the crippled son he had left behind.

But best of all are the beautiful echoes which are sent back in response to horrible yells, as on the mountain in Maine. You will all know how Joseph was ill-treated by his brothers. Yet there came a day when Joseph was in a position of power and his brothers had to kneel to him, as they said they never should do. Instead of treating them as they had dealt with him, Joseph replied by forgiving them. 'Ye thought evil against me,' he said, 'but God meant it for good'; by which he meant that God had taught him to be a Mr. Echo in the best possible way.

Does not that remind you of Jesus Christ our Lord? When wicked men nailed Him to a Cross, every possible feeling of hate and evil was unleashed against Him. Yet when it reached the heart of Jesus it was completely changed. Instead of seeking revenge against those who injured Him so wrongly He prayed, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.' The echoes from the Cross are sweet and beautiful.

Whenever we can rise to that level, we are being a Mr. Echo of whom Jesus must be really proud.

Big Ben.

By the Reverend Arthur G. Reekie, Peebles.

'. . . . his sound shall be heard.'—Ex 28^{35}.

If you were a member of the Brains Trust and were asked who is the most regular broadcaster, and if you answered, 'Big Ben,' you would be right. For Big Ben, though we hear him strike at 7 a.m. and at 9 p.m. only on the Home Service, broadcasts forty-three times every day on the numerous Overseas programmes of the B.B.C.

A hundred years ago when the Houses of Parliament were being built, the Government decided to have a clock of their own, 'a Noble clock, indeed a King of clocks, the biggest and best in the world, within sight and sound of the heart of London.' There were many difficulties to be overcome. Some experts said that a clock of such size would never work and there were many disputes about it. In 1854, the machinery for driving the clock was ready but the fourteen-ton hour bell wasn't. After much trouble, the bell was cast and brought to London. Soon it cracked and thus it was useless and another bell had to be made. When the new bell arrived large crowds gathered in the streets to cheer it. Alas, when it was fitted, the clock refused to go! The makers were worried, the critics were pleased, and others, including *Punch*, made jokes about it.

At last, in May 1859, the clock was in working order, and in due course became a great favourite of the people of London. On the last day of 1923, a new and important chapter began for, on that day, Big Ben made his first broadcast; the lovely chimes and the solemn boom were sent out to the ends of the earth. Since then, millions of people everywhere have heard the sound of Big Ben, so that we can say that it is not only the biggest clock in the world, it is also the best known.

When Parliament came to debate what to call its own clock many names were put forward but the name we know it by arose out of a long and boring speech. This speech was delivered by the Chief Lord of the Woods and Forests. (What a glorious title and what a shame to change it to the Office of Works!—wouldn't it be better to call the Minister for Agriculture the Chief Lord of the Fields, and the Minister for Food the Chief Lord of Jam and Spam!) Now, Sir Benjamin Hall, the Chief Lord of the Woods and Forests was a very big man, and his nickname was 'Big Ben.' When he sat down after making his dull speech, a weary member of the House of Commons cried, 'Why not call the clock "Big Ben" and have done with it?' Everyone laughed and the debate came to an end.

Do you know that there are four ways of listening to this world-famous clock? First, you can listen just because you wish to check your own watch or clock. The second way is to listen to it as the sound that means home to millions of people in the Dominions and all over the Empire. The third way is to hear the chimes as a prayer:

Lord, in this hour,
Thee, we confide,
That by Thy Power,
No foot may slide.

And, lastly, there is the Big Ben Minute Fellowship at 9 p.m. When the great clock strikes then many people unite before God in remembrance of absent friends, to pray for victory, and for peace on earth so that Christ's Kingdom may come.

The Christian Year.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Love in Action.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN MACINTYRE, B.D., KILMELFORD, ARGYLL.

'And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'—Mt 25^{40}.

'Is not this my chosen fast, the Lord, the Eternal, asks, to loosen all that fetters men unfairly, and to relax its grip, to free poor debtors from their bonds, and break what binds them? It is to share your food with hungry men, and take the homeless to your home, to clothe the naked when you see them, and never turn from any fellow-creature. Then shall light dawn for you, with healing for your wounds.'—Is 58^{6-8} (Moffatt).

How well that passage from Matthew illustrates the hardness of Christianity and at the same time its essential simplicity. When the dead shall stand before God and books are opened, men shall find themselves separated into two groups. Those on the right are those who succeeded in the hard task demanded of them. What hard task? The hard task of seeing Christ in their fellow men. How easily we would recognize Jesus if He came to us in the majesty of kingship or even as He walked in Galilee. But when He comes as a man asking bread, when He comes as a woman seeking some covering for her child how hard to recognize Him then. If He were in prison how gladly we would help Him. But how hard it is to believe that in serving men in prison we are serving Christ. You have heard of Tolstoy's story *Where Love is God is*. There are it seems to me two points in it. The meaning Tolstoy meant us to see in it was no doubt this—that in lovingly serving our fellow men and women we serve Christ. Is it legitimate to stress another point—that it took a vision, a direct revelation, to make the old cobbler realize this? Only after the vision and the voice did Martin recognize Christ in the snow-sweeper, in the soldier's wife, in the old apple seller.

That is the hard side but there is also a simpler side, something that is easy by comparison. Sometimes we are frightened by the seeming impossibility of carrying out Jesus' teaching, but look at these verses in Matthew. Is not your reaction 'How easy these things are to do provided the willingness to do them is there'? There is nothing complicated in giving a drink to a thirsty man: most of us, even in these days, can spare a meal for the hungry, or a garment for the naked. Or turn to these verses in Is 58 which so strangely foreshadow Jesus' teaching. Listen to them as they are given in Moffatt's translation—'This is the fast that I have chosen. . . . It is to share your food with hungry men, and take the homeless to your home, to clothe the naked when you see them, and never turn from any fellow-creature.'

That is the answer to those who say 'What can we do? The world's problems are far too big, too technical, for us to understand, far less solve.' Equally to be shunned is the optimist who says, 'I know exactly what is wrong and if my policy were followed the world would be put right in a year or two.' Neither the great prophet of ancient Israel nor Jesus took up either of these attitudes. Both said, 'Yes, there is something you can do if you will. Here to your hand lies a job of work. It is not attempting to do the impossible but taking a kindly interest in the needy, sharing your food with hungry men, clothing the naked, taking the homeless to your home. You can, if you will.'

Perhaps some one is saying 'That's a very uninspiring, middle-aged, little minded attitude. Didn't Jesus have a great vision of brotherhood, of righteousness, of love to all men?' Of course

He did and that vision continues to challenge us to this day. On the other hand let it be said with all reverence, Jesus was far too sensible to imagine that you can walk before you can crawl. By all means keep before you the ideal of being able to walk, to run, to fly, but first of all learn to crawl. By all means have your great vision, but do the simple tasks that lie to your hand. Do not make the vision an excuse for evading these.

'I was an hungered and ye gave me meat. I was thirsty and ye gave me drink. I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me.' There is the challenge of Jesus' teaching, a challenge all the greater because of its simplicity. For some fail to respond because of that very thing—its simplicity. Who does not know the story of Naaman, the Syrian general! The great man came in search of Elisha to be cured of his leprosy and he pictured the prophet doing it in some dramatic fashion. Elisha would call upon the name of Jehovah, lift up his hands in blessing and then touch the leper and lo he would be clean. Instead the prophet sent out his servant to Naaman with the message, 'Go wash in Jordan seven times.' And the great man turned away in a rage: he had been prepared for great things, he would not demean himself by doing this. There is a great deal of insight in that old story, for there are some who shrink from the small tasks which they consider demeaning while they look for great things.

Not that the small tasks, the humble services are demeaning. Jesus linked them with His own Person. 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto Me, to Me your King, your Master and your Judge.' So Isaiah speaks of such actions as the fast that God has chosen in preference to magnificent ceremonial. In both, the teaching on these simple, helpful actions is linked with the Divine. There is a very definite connexion between these homely, 'unremembered acts of kindness and of love' and Almighty God. This connexion gives them added dignity and makes the spirit they express enduring. This connexion with the will of God raises them above sentimentality and our changing moods. To be constantly reminded that Christ may come in the guise of a beggar seeking bread is to be constantly stirred to true charity. For what does charity mean but love in action! All we who love the Lord Jesus will seek to express that love in our attitude to those in need. God help us to see Him in them.

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Lowly of Heart.

'Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.'—Mt 5^3.

All the words of Jesus, and more especially the Beatitudes are a deep unfathomable well of truth and inspiration and challenging thought, whose depths we can never hope finally to plumb. As we turn them over in our minds they shine with new beauty. There is an eternal element in them. Jesus Himself, with calm authoritative assurance, claimed that though heaven and earth passed away His words would abide for ever. There is in them a message for every age and for every successive generation. But there is a sense in which they are extraordinarily appropriate at the present time. There is special force in their impact upon our minds at this hour. Many are feeling deeply conscious that just now great waves of circumstances are carrying us all back to a mountain-side near the Galilean lake to the feet of the most wonderful of all Teachers, who so long ago gathered His disciples round Him and taught them.

To usher in a redeemed Society, to create a new order of life, was the work to which Jesus set Himself. In words that ring out like the strokes of a hammer, Mark tells us Jesus came into Galilee preaching, and teaching men concerning the Kingdom of God. But if the Kingdom is to come it must begin in the lives of individuals. The Beatitudes are first and foremost the picture of a man drawn by the Great Master's hand. It is the portrait of the kind of citizen required for the establishment, spread and perpetuation of the redeemed society. Every necessary virtue is set down. And first in order of importance is this strange challenging word. It is so familiar to us that we cannot imagine the surprise it must have given to those who first heard it. It cut across all their preconceived notions. For long they had looked and prayed for the coming Messiah, the Deliverer, who would break the bondage in which the nation was held and set the people free. They looked for a king, a great military leader, who would lead the people to a dominating place among the nations. In the 'days of His flesh' Palestine was like a banked fire. The fires of national patriotism were for ever smouldering beneath the surface. How it surprised them when Jesus began to teach, saying, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit: for *theirs* is the kingdom of heaven.' If moral rearmament is to come, if society is to be redeemed, if the rule of God is to spread throughout the world, here it must begin. Here are the portals of the heavenly kingdom.

What did He mean by these words? If, to use the language of an older generation of preachers, we use the 'method of exclusion,' we can see what He did not mean. He does not mean the poor-spirited who can be insulted with impunity. He does not mean those who are full of self-pity or self-depreciation. His bitterest enemies could never have accused Jesus of that. Pilate, the Roman Centurion, and the mob in the Garden of Gethsemane were subdued by His dignity. He never belittled Himself or the things He deemed to be important. He magnified His message. The Gospels express the magnificent self-assertion of Jesus. 'Ye have heard it said by them of old time . . . but *I* say unto you.' No, He certainly meant none of these things.

The root idea of this saying is humility. We may restate these words and say,' Blessed are the

humble-minded, the lowly of heart, for *theirs* is the kingdom of heaven.' Everything else is built on that. Here the Lord begins to paint the picture of the citizen of the Kingdom as a man who is conscious of being nothing, of having nothing, and who has lost all self-conceit. *That* man will reach the highest place, the place of kinship in the sight of God, and God will rule in his heart. It surprised them. In the ancient world humility was not a virtue, it was a vice. It was held to be shameful and contemptible. Are we sure it is held more highly in the modern world ? In one of his letters, the great poet, Keats, says, ' I hate humility.' Heine has described it as ' the virtue of a hound.' Dickens has pilloried it in his picture of Uriah Heep. Truly, the humble of heart are sore to seek ! But if moral rearmament is to be achieved, if the nations are to be redeemed, we must all start here.

In exalting humility Jesus is castigating pride. Pride has been catalogued as one of the seven deadly sins. It is selfishness in its deadliest, most subtle form. By implication Jesus gives it first place in destructive power. It has been responsible for a long list of nameless cruelties. It is far more heinous than any sin of the flesh. And all the great masters support Him in His condemnation of it. Dante places the proud on the lowest rung of purgatory. But he tells us, as with his guide he climbed to the second rung, he heard a strain of ineffable song, ' Blessed are the poor in spirit.' That is the cure for pride. John Bunyan, too, whose works live because they are a true reading of life tells how, in the Valley of Humiliation, Christian's pride was slain. That valley is a lovely place, full of unexpected beauties and treasures, and as Christian rose to his feet and made his way onward he, too, heard a voice singing :

> He that is down needs fear no fall :
> He that is low, no pride ;
> He that is humble ever shall
> Have God to be his guide.

Those who are ' poor in spirit ' are those in whom pride in all its forms has been slain. Some are proud of their possessions. Do they possess anything that ultimately they do not owe to God, to the labour of others, to the security that society has provided ? Some are proud of their native endowment of natural ability. Was it not given to them by God ? Some are proud of their knowledge. When they know more they will be humbler in spirit. Some are proud of their character. That was the sin of the Pharisee. ' God, I thank thee that I am not as other men.' How foolish it is to be proud in the light of our frailty and insufficiency, our dependence on others for all we possess. Yet the world is full of pride. The ' atmosphere ' in which we live is tense, almost beyond endurance, because nations are full of the pride of race and state.

Is it not a striking thing that the truly noble have nearly always been men and women of humble spirit ? Augustine's *Confessions* reveal the depth of his genuine humility, a humility of spirit that became even deeper as the years went by. Great physicians like Lister have been noted for their humility. Leading scientists never exhibit pride of knowledge. They know how much there is still to learn and they are humble in face of the mystery of things. Did not Socrates, the wisest man of his age, tell his fellows that all he could do was to reveal to them how little he and they knew. These men were not mean-spirited. They were noble and dignified because they were humble. Pride had been slain.

Where does the blessedness lie ? It lies in seeing ourselves as we really are, in opening our lives and minds to the thrust of reality, in cultivating the vision of God. Blessedness lies in the saving knowledge that our sufficiency is not of ourselves, but of God. The best of us are weak, and needy, and sinful. Compared to what we ought to be our righteousness is as ' filthy rags.' We have no security for the things that really matter in ourselves. The most obvious modern sin is that of complacency. We think we are ' not so bad,' at least ' not so bad as that publican.' Are we really sure we are as fine and good as we might be ? A sheep in the green fields looks pure and clean. Against a white background of snow it is filthy and defiled. And so are we in the light of God's Holy Eternal Love. There is nothing in us to be proud of. When we see ourselves against God's self-revelation in Jesus Christ we become conscious of our utter need.

As in Guinevere's song, when at last the veil had fallen from her eyes, while she looked out on the snowclad, moonlit land :

> As these white robes are soiled and dark
> To yonder virgin ground,
> As this pale taper's earthly spark
> To yonder argent round—
> So shows my soul before the Lamb,
> My spirit before Thee.

Cease to strive and learn to trust. That, too, is part of the meaning of ' poor in spirit ' : that, too, is part of the blessedness. God's rule *begins* and the Kingdom comes when we cease to strive and learn to *trust.*

To be poor in spirit is to be receptive of heart and of a teachable spirit. The proud of heart are neither. They isolate themselves. But true blessedness awaits the receptive heart and the teachable spirit. Paul had learned that lesson when he wrote, ' I can do all things through Christ, who is my strength.' That is his version of the first Beatitude. After all, who is more equal to life's demands, opportunities and circumstances than that man or woman who knows that every good and perfect gift and all grace come from God ! But only the humble of heart know the blessedness of their possession. The great exemplar of this kind of character is Jesus Himself. His teaching has flamed into life ! Greater always than the wonder of His words is the wonder of His life. On the night in which He was betrayed He girded Himself with a towel and washed His disciples' feet. That is the first Beatitude in action. When we are tempted to

be proud, when hot words are trembling on our lips, may we see it and ponder it. May we hear a voice saying to each of us,

'The servant is not greater than his lord.
Take my yoke upon you and learn of me,
For I am meek and lowly of heart.' [1]

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Consecration of Friendship.

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND A. D. HARCUS, M.A.,
EALING, LONDON.

'I have called you friends.'—Jn 15^{15}.

Friendship is fully equipped to be an instrument of the Kingdom of God. A universal, who so poor as hath not a friend; a freedom, our friends are our own choice; powerful, not only in individual lives but also in the community and in the shaping of history; and finally, with the authority of our Lord, not only in the decisive words of the text but in His whole outlook He made friendship central and creative in the Kingdom of God.

The Opportunity. Friendship has always been a way of influencing others but to-day there are special reasons for emphasizing the value of this instrument. Yesterday, friendship, in the main, was within a limited circle fixed by one's community or locality, a school, a college, an office, a games club, and last but not least, a Church. To-day, in great numbers people have been scattered abroad, to make new contacts and therefore the possibility of new friendships. This is specially true of younger folk, away from home and beyond the usual circle of their lives, scattered and re-scattered from camp to camp, depot to depot, in small groups and in large communities. There is going on throughout the land a continual making and remaking of friendships old and new. The first great extension of the Church is thus described in the Book of Acts, 'They that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the word.' Christian influence was like seed blown by the wind, to find a place, a root, and a harvest everywhere. Christian friendship is like that and to-day can be the day of opportunity for the increase of the Kingdom of God through its influence.

And here a word of caution is necessary—to beware of the easy use, and therefore perhaps the misuse of the opportunity. Friendship for a purpose, even a religious purpose is not friendship pure and unalloyed. It has been well said, 'Friendship that is begun for an end will not continue to the end.' Friendship is an instrument, and yet to use it directly and intentionally as an instrument is to defeat the desired end. The answer to this apparent dilemma is that friendship is an end in itself. The answer indeed is that friendship need not be used for any end, rather it should be consecrated to God. Friendship at the highest level is a final value. Let it to itself be true, and without thinking of means or ends it will accomplish the purpose for which God created it. When Jesus said, 'I have called you friends' He stated both the process and the achievement, He indicated both the campaign and the victory of the Kingdom. The opportunity of to-day, a great opportunity, will be used for a permanent good if friendship is true to its highest and best self.

The Use of the Opportunity. Thus viewed friendship ceases to be mere gain. The fact remains we do gain, for this can never be one-way traffic, but primarily we are giving and only secondarily receiving. And that makes all the difference in our outlook. True we may say as advice to some much loved girl or boy as they set out on the adventure of enlistment, 'try to make good friends' and in our prayers we shall hope they are receiving strength and help from older and wiser friends. But for the person concerned, however young and inexperienced, to start off looking for the stronger personality to be his friend is to be in danger of misusing the gift. Let him look around the crowded room and there will be some one in need of a kindly word and smile. The depot will have so many gathered together seemingly at haphazard, so many younger ones straight from home. Right away let friendship begin her perfect work. What an opportunity.

And friendship ceases to be mere enjoyment, indeed we may have to speak at times of the pain rather than of the pleasure. How often we fail as friends because we are afraid of giving offence or causing pain. Something clearly is wrong, a dangerous tendency that could be dealt with in time, a disease of the mind that could be cured, perhaps an unpleasant habit that could be mastered, and only friendship can speak. We refrain because we do not want to disturb a pleasant relationship, it is easier to keep silent. 'Speak the truth in love,' says the Apostle. A most difficult art, it is easy to speak it in indifference or in spite or hate. But to speak it in love demands friendship of a high order. Carry on the idea and say, 'let love speak the truth' and that becomes the great imperative of true friendship. If it can be done then two powers come into action, each of them strong in itself and together almost irresistible, truth and love. One recalls a demonstration at an engineering exhibition; a skilled workman was fashioning and shaping a piece of metal; in each hand he had a burner, each with an intensely hot flame. Skilfully blending these together he did what he willed with the stubborn metal. The truth spoken in friendship has this double power and to keep silent through fear of unpleasantness is to be false to friendship. The gift is consecrated. That does not mean it is to be used for a purpose, however high and noble the purpose may be, but it does mean it has to be at its very best, personal likes and comforts ignored, and the wellbeing of our friend all that matters.

The Power to Use the Opportunity. So far the argument has been in human terms, strength in us, stability, confidence, all these to be for our friend; and to repeat, friendship has never had such an opportunity as to-day. But who is sufficient for these things? Do we speak of our-

[1] J. Short, *All Things are Yours*, 13.

selves as active agents, as the originators of power? That would be heresy indeed, to make our power of friendship the prime mover of the Kingdom of God. The truth is we are not originators but recipients of power. Friendship is a chain or better still, a channel, and such power as we have is power that passes through us. All that has been said of friendship in terms of giving can be repeated now in terms of gain. 'I have called you friends,' said Jesus. Think of His friendship for us, His strength made perfect in our weakness, His sincerity speaking the truth to us in love. Friendship is revealed in the Gospels. They were to speak of Him afterwards as one with a Name and in that Name every knee would bow and every tongue proclaim Him Lord, but they remembered Him as He was with them in Galilee and the friendship of those memorable days. How He consecrated this fine human quality and it became, in His hands, the perfect instrument of the Kingdom. 'For their sakes I sanctify myself,' so St. John gives the key to His inner mind.

'I have called you friends' and we receive through friendship what we urgently need as from a great inexhaustible reservoir of grace and truth. 'Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you.' Friendship is a channel, a receiving and a giving, and so the opportunity of to-day through friendship consecrated to the Kingdom of God. What an increase there could be just through the simple sincere use of this great gift of God, and therefore our prayers for our friends everywhere, those whom we know and love, are that they may make good friendships and be themselves good friends.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Old Report and the New Insight.

'I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye seeth thee.'—Job 42^5.

Our knowledge of God is of two kinds, traditional and personal. The first is hearsay religion. In this way, we know God simply by the testimony and on the authority of other people, who have registered their religious experience and borne witness to what God did in the home or the nation in their time. This traditional religion is the support and rallying-point of many spirits, and we are all deeply grateful for it and are partly constituted by it. But it is not enough to know about God.

Our religion must not be an old report but a new insight. Inherited truths are apt to seem unreal and out of touch with the urgent and clamant needs of the present. In the crash of world affairs they tend to appear ancient and obsolete, like old-fashioned clothes. How can a traditional knowledge of God be a suitable equipment for the novel and desperate demands of the hour? Our forefathers lived under different historical and economic conditions, and there is a suspicion that God may have had a different purpose for them so that no one can tell whether God will act in the same way now. Thus the knowledge of God which has no warrant for its truth save the word of others long since dead, which has been taught as part of our school curriculum and home training but never tested by personal experiment in the present, fails to convince and succour the spirit in extremity. A novelist says about a certain place of worship: 'The whole church had the smell of clothes, shut up in a closet, that had not been worn for a very long time.' Carlyle turned into the old clothes market and looked at the empty suits and as he thought of the romantic figures and distinguished men who had worn them, exclaimed, 'These old garments are ghosts of life, come to judgment.' Yes, amid the shocks of change and catastrophe, a merely traditional religion is inadequate and outworn, and is discarded as something which has served its day.

What is needed is not an old report, but a new insight which will verify and extend it. If a man's vision cannot be personally vouched for, then his religious knowledge becomes mechanical and impotent. Bacon described such religion as 'bed-ridden truths.' A man's religious ideas may become so lame and infirm that they cannot get up and do a good day's work. Inherited religion may be an obstacle to enlightenment and progress, and it opposed Jesus, who told the scribes and Pharisees that their traditions made void the commandments of God, because these men were holding on to venerable externals but had never got to the inward, personal reality. Our religion must be thoroughly our own. What makes this specially necessary is that religion must be organized; the Church needs doctrine and ordinance and ecclesiastical apparatus to give it systematic form which will protect it from mundane forces, but this armour may at times become too heavy, and weigh down the spiritual life of the Church. The vitalizing antidote to this is personal conviction. People must test and probe the ruling of an outside authority and find out for themselves how it works in practice and so get the truth and spirit inside them. They must apply their faith and use their religious knowledge in action, if they are to make any spiritual discovery. The traditional must pass into the personal, and be revived, corrected, and completed by the new vision of those who are in touch with God.

This does not hint at disparagement of the historic faith enshrined in the sacred memories and experiences of Christian people through the centuries. Dame Laura Knight went to live among the circus people that she might paint the horses, the clowns, and the acrobats of the ring, and she saw for herself and did original work with a verve and technique of her own, in which she expressed what she knew, loved, and understood, but she could also revere the masterpieces of Rembrandt which she studied in Amsterdam, and pay a tribute to their genius. The individual's experience of God is a counterpoise to the authoritarian view, not a substitute for it.

The dogmatic and ecclesiastical inheritance may be quite detached from us, like a foreign cathedral

we view with a Baedeker in our hand, something in which we have no vital share, unless some part of this spiritual world becomes real to us and takes possession of us on some side of our nature. There must be some aspect of the truth, some element of the gospel, which appeals to us specially, and lays hold of us, and becomes our own. One man may be attracted by the personality of Jesus, and his religion is hero-worship and idealism: another may feel helpless, broken, sin-stained, and he comes into the Christian life for forgiveness and recovery. Some hearts may be set aglow by Christian principles, some may be won by the charm of Divine love, some may be drawn by God's welcome for sinful folk. Hence there are varieties of religious experience, and the new conviction takes diverse forms and expresses itself in the different accents of individuality.

But what is the starting-point at which the unconvincing tradition is translated into a saving experience of God? How does it begin to happen to us. Religion may become real to us only when we see it at work in other lives and make a personal discovery of its results. Hugh Redwood relates that he was a cynical journalist, but when he came into touch with the Salvation Army, and witnessed the salvage of human wrecks and derelicts in the slums it was a revelation to him of God's redeeming love, and the unconvincing tradition became a converting experience in his life and made him a new man. When Einstein, the agnostic Jewish scientist, saw that the only people in Germany who dared to oppose Adolph Hitler were Christian pastors, he was deeply impressed by the dynamic qualities of the Christian religion, and unconvincing tradition was changed into an admiration and inquiry which may yet prove a saving experience of God for Einstein. Thus Redwood and Einstein glimpsed God for themselves.

'I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee.' These words were spoken by Job who had been a rebel spirit. Job had a combative mind, which questioned inherited religious theories and challenged traditional ideas in religion, because he had suffered, and considered his suffering a gross miscarriage of justice. As G. K. Chesterton says, 'He demands an explanation from God, in the spirit in which a wife might demand an explanation from her husband whom she really respected. How did the old report about a dependable God become a new insight? Well, God answered Job's complaint out of the whirlwind, from the midst of the storm, but the Divine answer did not solve all Job's problems or reply to all his questions or afford a clue to all the enigmas of existence. By no means! It revealed *the sublimity of Nature*, and reassured him that such scenic majesty must be the setting, the framework of some splendid intention. When earth, sea, and sky are so impressive, there must be something still greater going on to satisfy the heart. Job was fascinated by the huge scale of God's activity and began to revel in it, and to feel that the world was worth living in after all. He was not only thrilled by the Divine magnitude but also touched by the Divine mercy, for God reveals His love by sending rain to desert solitudes and giving food to wild animals, and if He cares so much for the trackless wastes and the dumb beasts, what folly to suspect He is careless about us? Surely the Divine character was such as to be trusted and reverenced, without misgiving. Admiration was Job's approach to peace of mind. In his poem, *Martin's Puzzle*, George Meredith tells how Martin the cobbler made his spiritual discovery by seeing *the transformation of human nature*, the grace of Christian character. Martin was greatly perplexed by the unhappy fate of Molly, a cripple girl, and he wondered at the stricken little lass who could 'talk like a song,' and 'give gladness while limping along.'

Martin's questions were not all answered any more than Job's, but Martin was reassured and secured peace of mind by seeing what human nature can rise to in such grace of spirit as Molly's. Her character was a coercive revelation of God's love at work and moved the cobbler to worship. Real religion began when he made the suggestion of kneeling with Molly in prayer, to get a personal impression, a new conviction, an individual vision, and the old report would be changed into a fresh insight.

Is our religion simply a legacy from the past lying idle, a frozen asset, or is it capital whose value we have proved and increased by investing it in our life? Have we tested and augmented the truth received from others by applying it to ourselves? There must be personal choice of Jesus Christ, and personal contact with Him, if our religion is to be a real, potent, victorious force in our lives. We must be in constant touch with Him and know in our own heart that He is able to save unto the uttermost. You and I should make sure that we know this, not as an old report but as a new insight. 'I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee.' [1]

[1] A. A. Cowan, *Crisis on the Frontier*, 41.

Great Texts Reconsidered.

By the Reverend Professor J. E. L. Oulton, D.D., Trinity College, University of Dublin.

'We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.'—He 13[10].

In order to interpret this difficult verse, it is desirable to have before us the whole paragraph in which it occurs, together with the preceding verse.

> 9. 'Be not carried away by divers and strange teachings: for it is good that the heart be stablished by grace; not by meats, wherein they that occupied themselves were not profited.
>
> 10. We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle (ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον, ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες). 11. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the holy place by the high priest as an offering for sin, are burned without the camp. 12. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered without the gate. 13. Let us therefore go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach. 14. For we have not here an abiding city, but we seek after the city which is to come. 15. Through him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his name. 16. But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.'

Ch. 13 of this Epistle consists of a number of short paragraphs, of which *vv.*[10-16] is the longest. A connexion in thought may be detected running through several of the paragraphs; but the absence of a connecting particle in the Greek clearly shows where each new paragraph begins. That the subject matter of *v.*[9] is not unconnected with the subject matter of *vv.* [10-16] has been noted by all commentators; but they have failed to note that the writer regarded *v.*[10] as beginning a new paragraph—a fact not without significance.

The case of those who interpret *v.*[10] of the Eucharist is best presented in the words of Westcott. 'Briefly the argument is this: We Christians *have* an altar, from which we draw the material for our feast. In respect of this, our privilege is greater than that of priest or high-priest under the Levitical system. Our great sin-offering, consumed in one sense outside the gate, is given to us as our food. The Christian therefore who can partake of Christ, offered for his sins, is admitted to a privilege unknown under the old Covenant.'

Among the objections which may be offered to this interpretation of the passage are the following. (1) *V.*[9] gives the mind of the writer on the subject of religious practices connected with food, the observance of which he strongly disparages; and it is strange that almost in the same breath he should go on to speak of the great privilege the Christian enjoys in partaking of his sacrificial meal. True, *v.*[10] begins a new paragraph: but we do not expect the writer to say in *v.*[10] the opposite of what he has said in *v.*[9] without giving us some warning. (2) No indication is given in *vv.*[11. 12] that Jesus is to Christians *more* than the perfect sin-offering. If Westcott is right, the writer has failed to mention in these verses what is the chief point in the argument. (3) At the close of the paragraph (*v.*[15]) the writer indicates the kind of sacrificial offering he approves, namely, praise to God and service of men: it is *with such sacrifices* that God is well pleased. This is surely quite inconsistent with the view that in *v.*[10] the writer is speaking of a Christian sacrificial meal which he regards as 'a privilege unknown under the old Covenant.'

Those who dissent from the view presented by Westcott usually interpret *v.*[10] as follows: οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες simply means 'worshippers,' *i.e.*, Christian worshippers, referring to the same persons as the subject of ἔχομεν: 'The altar of Christian worship is not an altar from which the worshippers of the sanctuary have a right to eat' (J. M. Creed in The Expository Times, L. 13). It follows then that 'in real Christian worship there is no sacrificial meal; the Christian sacrifice is not one of which the worshippers partake by eating' (J. Moffatt, in *I.C.C.*, 234). So also, more or less emphatically, Dods, T. H. Robinson. This point they find reinforced in *vv.*[11. 12] which speak of the sin offering—an offering that was *not* eaten by the priest or worshipper—and compare it with the offering of Christ. Finally, the language of *v.*[15] is brought in to reinforce the argument that the kind of sacrifice which in the mind of the author God approved was not a sacrificial meal but rather praise and good works. Some of these writers even go further and maintain that the passage is polemical and directed against a realistic view of the Lord's Supper which the author of *Hebrews* noted and was impelled to protest against.

While I am prepared to endorse the view that *v.*[10] does not bear the meaning which Westcott and others have read into it, there are several points in the arguments of Westcott's opponents which seem to me to call for criticism. (1) οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες is a strange phrase for Christian worshippers. There is no apparent reason why

the writer should express himself in this way, or so obscurely; and the run of the sentence naturally suggests that the subject of ἔχομεν and the subject of ἔχουσιν are different kinds of persons. J. M. Creed, in his admirable summary of views on this passage in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES confesses 'some hesitation' in accepting it, although in the main he approves the point of view of Moffatt and the others. (2) That the author of *Hebrews* should mean to imply that 'in real Christian worship there is no sacrificial meal' is startling and difficult to accept. We may indeed infer with comparative certainty that he was not the kind of person who would set great store by sacramental observances. He was, as Moffatt observes, 'a spiritual idealist' (*I.C.C.*, 234). But he might well be this, and yet not prepared to repudiate the Christian Eucharist altogether or openly to disparage it. It may be that if he had followed his Platonic idealism to its logical conclusion, he would have been led to this position. But few men, if any, are absolutely logical in applying their philosophical and religious convictions to their actual practices; and, as we see from $6^{1.\ 2}$, the author of *Hebrews* had a place for sacramental acts, although he was eager that his readers should not simply rest upon them, but rather go forward in the Christian life to 'perfection.' Further, we are not justified in assuming too close and intimate connexion between *v.*[9], with its disparagement of 'meats,' and the following verse. In any case, what those 'meats' exactly were—whether Jewish food taboos or pagan cult feasts—we do not know. And St. Paul at any rate was able to combine a healthy contempt for 'meats' with a deep reverence for and appreciation of the Lord's Supper. These considerations, as it seems to me, should make us pause before we accept an interpretation of 13^{10} which makes the writer assert that no place for the Eucharist can be found in Christian worship. (3) It is true that the Jewish sin offering was not eaten, according to the Law: but it is rather strange, if the object of *vv.*[11. 12] is to emphasize this point and to use it as a parallel with the Christian sin offering, that the author does not say so in so many words. No doubt it is implied in the statement that the bodies of the victims 'are burned without the camp.' But he does not *say* 'the sacrifice is not for eating.'

I venture, therefore, to put forward a modified interpretation of the passage with a view to removing the difficulties I have mentioned. The true meaning of οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες is to be seen by a comparison of $8^{4.\ 5}$: 'Now if he were on earth, he would not be a priest at all, seeing there are those who offer the gifts according to the law; who serve (λατρεύουσι) that which is a copy and shadow of the heavenly things, even as Moses was warned of God when he was about to make the tabernacle (τὴν σκηνήν): for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern that was shewed thee in the mount.' 'They that serve the tabernacle' primarily refers to the Jewish priests who, by a use of the historic present, could be spoken of in writings long subsequent to A.D. 70 as if they were still functioning (see Moffatt, *I.C.C.*, p. xxii., with references to Josephus, Clement of Rome and *Ep. ad Diognetum*); but also in a wider sense to all who take part in worship of a sensuous character at a visible shrine. This figurative, wider, use of σκηνὴ is compatible with either view concerning the recipients of the Epistle, whether they were Jewish or Gentile Christians, but is perhaps more natural if they were Gentiles and the writer's argument from Judaism was merely academic. σκηνὴ as used in *Hebrews* always refers to an earthly tabernacle or, as in 11^{9}, to the earthly, transitory habitation of the patriarchal heroes of faith. It never means the higher, heavenly tabernacle, unless defined by ἀληθινὴ (8^{2}) or μείζων καὶ τελειότερα as in 9^{11}. To take σκηνὴ as the *locus* of *Christian* worship, as Moffatt and others do, is to run counter to the ideas which the Epistle associates with the word. The meaning of *v.*[10] is that Christians have an altar whereof they have no right to eat whose worship is sensuous and earth-bound. The writer does not specify exactly what the Christian altar is; but his general meaning cannot be in doubt. Jesus is not 'on earth' (8^{4}), but at the right hand of God (12^{2}), and the altar is in the sphere of invisible realities, whether it be Jesus Himself or Jesus conceived of as High Priest and Victim. The writer is concerned merely to state the incompatibility between the two kinds of worship, the earthly and the heavenly. His object is negative—to point out that the one kind of worshipper cannot share in the other's worship. He does not tell us whether or no Christians 'eat of' (φαγεῖν) *their* altar. In any case, the metaphor of eating, under the term γεύεσθαι is applied in $6^{4.\ 5}$ to partaking of spiritual realities without any suggestion of sacramental means; cf. also 'taste of death' (γεύσηται θανάτου) in 2^{9}.

The object of the two following verses, *vv.*[11. 13], is not to show that the Jewish sin offering and the Christian sin offering are, neither of them, eaten; still less is it to suggest as Westcott and also Hicks (*The Fullness of Sacrifice*, 236) do, that as contrasted with the Jewish sin offering the Christian sin offering *is* eaten; but rather to seize on a detail in the prescribed Levitical ritual which to the mind of the writer was significantly paralleled in the Passion narrative. The bodies of the beasts slain as a sin offering were burned

without the camp (Lv 16^{27}); Jesus suffered *without the gate*. (It is obvious that there is no parallel in the death of Jesus corresponding to the fact that the bodies of the beasts were burned; and it is not clear what Westcott means by saying that our great sin offering was 'consumed in one sense' outside the gate.) The writer attaches deep spiritual significance to the situation of Calvary in its relation to Jerusalem. It calls us not so much to unworldliness (Moffatt) as to *other-worldliness*. Jesus had left the city behind Him when He offered the perfect, eternal sacrifice upon the Cross. We must follow Him in this as in all else. 'Let us therefore go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach. For we have not here an abiding city, but we seek after the city which is to come.' The words 'bearing his reproach' turn our thoughts back to the example of Moses (11^{23-28}) who 'accounted the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt,' and remind us that we too are to 'endure as seeing him that is invisible.' Other-worldliness must govern the spirit of our worship as of all else. 'Through him, then,' as He ministers in a tabernacle not of this world, 'let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually.' And then, as if to indicate that true other-worldliness does not neglect the duties that fall to the Christian in this life, the writer adds '*But* to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.'

The several paragraphs in ch. 13 are concerned, as is fitting in a final chapter (cf. St. Paul, *passim*), with practical exhortations: *e.g.*, in regard to hospitality (*vv.*$^{1, 2}$), care for prisoners (*v.*^{3}), marriage (*v.*^{4}), and so forth. *Vv.*$^{10-16}$ are no exception to this: their object is to set out the Christian duty of worship and service. They are not primarily doctrinal, but the doctrine they contain is based on the philosophical and theological position taken up in the main body of the Epistle, and especially in its latter portion. Any interpretation of *v.*^{10} which fails to take this into account must be unsatisfactory.

Contributions and Comments.

A Note on 'εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως' in Romans i. 5 and xvi. 26.

It would appear that little attention has been paid by commentators and translators generally to the significant phrase εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως which occurs in Ro 1^{5} and 16^{26}. The A.V. translates the first 'for obedience to *the* faith' and the second 'for the obedience of faith'; Moffatt renders 'to promote obedience to *the* faith' and 'for their obedience to *the* faith'; while Weymouth's version reads 'to the obedience that springs from faith' in the first instance, and (inconsistently) 'to obedience to *the* faith,' in the second. The American Revised Version translates 'unto obedience of faith' (which is non-committal, since '*the* faith' is understood as an alternative in each case). Denney (*Expositor's Greek Testament*, 587) makes the striking equation 'obedience which consists in faith.' Hoskyns, in his translation of Karl Barth's *Epistle to the Romans* (Oxford University Press, 1933, p. 27), renders Ro 1^{5} by the expanded phrase 'to bring into being obedience to the faithfulness of God.' Barth regards Ro 16^{25-27} (the doxology) as an addition which should be deleted. In a footnote (*op. cit.*, 522) he translates 'unto obedience of faith,' thereby abandoning his interesting translation of 1^{5}. His argument against the authenticity of the doxology would be considerably weakened were he to retain the same translation in each occurrence.

Surely in both cases 'obedience that springs from faith' is intended, πίστεως being a genitive of source or material (Nunn, *A Syntax of New Testament Greek*, § 25; see also J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*, Macmillan, 1895, p. 246). If '*the* faith' (*i.e.* a body of formulated doctrine), had been intended, doubtless the definite article would have been used (cf. Ac 6^{7} ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει; Ro 10^{8} τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως).

The whole verse, Ro 1^{5}, seems to have caused trouble for translators, who usually find it necessary to change the word-order (*e.g.* Weymouth). May we not take this verse as a statement of Paul's commission to the Gentiles, and render: '. . . Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we (I) have received grace and a commission (of apostleship) with a view to (promoting) obedience which springs from faith among the Gentiles, because of His character (ὑπερ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ)'? The emphasis is on the obedience to God which comes as a result of faith in Christ. Ro 16 suggests a mixed Church at Rome, made up of both Jewish and Gentile Christians. What Paul has to say about the Mosaic law and the destiny of Israel would be of secondary interest to the Gentile Christians, but what he has to say about obedience to God which comes as a result of faith in Christ would be pregnant with meaning, in view of his vivid picture of the whole world guilty before God because of sin (Ro 3^{23}).

In confirmation of this, I refer to Ro 5^{19}, which I would select as the key-verse of the Epistle,

Here it is made clear that 'through the obedience of One (διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνός) the mass of mankind will be made righteous' (Moffatt). The redemption of all mankind by Christ is stated in terms which will be understood by both Jewish and Gentile Christians. Man's sin of disobedience is made abundantly clear in the first chapter, whether it be understood as disobedience to the Mosaic law or to God's law as written into the very constitution of the universe (Ro $1^{19.\ 20}$). Ro 1^{16} is then explained by 5^{19}; there would be no 'gospel of Christ' if there had not been the disobedience of sinners and the subsequent obedience of Christ to the will of God. It was Christ's obedience to God that was all-important (see Ph 2^{8}; cf. the similar thought in He 5^{8}). Christ was not only the example to Gentile Christians of the perfect obedience which springs from perfect faith, but also the source of power whereby obedience to God could be realized in their own lives.

Ro 16^{26} is then a recapitulation of the purposes expressed in Ro 1^{5} (εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη=εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). This is an additional support to Hort's view (see J. B. Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, Macmillan, 1904, pp. 327–8) that Romans, chs. 1–16 (including the doxology), is the original letter. The doxology forms a fitting conclusion by asserting again the great themes of the Epistle. The MSS. evidence for the position of the doxology at the end of Romans 16 (*i.e.* ℵ B C D Vulg. Pesh., Eth., etc.) is certainly strong. The influence of Marcion (who excised the last two chapters) may account for the position of the doxology after Ro 14^{23} in L, 37, 47, and many cursives (see Sanday and Headlam, *Epistle to the Romans* in *I.C.C.*, pp. xcvi, xcvii). In any case, it is unlikely that Lightfoot is right in suggesting that the doxology originally occurred after Ro 14^{23} as a conclusion to an abridged recension (an encyclical), for Paul would have interrupted the thought-sequence which continues to 15^{13}, had he inserted the doxology at 14^{23}. Barth considers these concluding verses to be an addition by Marcion as a liturgical conclusion to Ro 14^{23}, which was later transferred to the end of ch. 16. His argument, which is based on the style of the passage in question, does not seem to take due cognizance of Hort's linguistic evidence—the many coincidences in language in the doxology and throughout the Epistle (see Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, 326–7). Furthermore, it seems strange that only the comparatively unimportant MSS. F and G should have omitted the doxology altogether, unless Marcionite influence on the text is greater than we suppose.

The genuineness of chs. 15 and 16 may be argued on other grounds, but it is interesting to note that in Ro 15^{18} we find the phrase εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἐθνῶν, which is once more a statement of the purpose of 'the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles' (15^{16}).

GEOFFREY H. PARKE-TAYLOR.

Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada.

ὑπέρ with Genitive in N.T.

THE usage of ὑπὲρ, as a preposition with the genitive, is of considerable importance in the N.T. In *itself*, the word does not mean 'instead of,' yet it is several times used in N.T. with a notion of substitution. So in classical Greek, *e.g.* in the *Alcestis*. A frequent use = on behalf of, as in Col 1^{7}, Epaphras was a faithful minister of Christ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν: Jn 11^{50}, it is expedient that one single man should die ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ, though it is clear that, as the rest of the clause indicates, the meaning is *instead of*. Philem ^{13}: I was minded to keep Onesimus with me that he might minister to me ὑπὲρ σοῦ. In Mt 5^{44}, 1 Ti 2^{1} the meaning required is 'for the sake of.' It is in the Pauline epistles that we find—or seem to find—the substitutionary notion implied in the preposition; 1 Co 15^{3}, Christ died ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν (= in expiation of, as in He 5^{1} 7^{27}). In 15^{29} Paul is speaking of those who are wont to be baptized ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν = in place of the dead; and this use is precisely paralleled by a sentence in Dion. Halicar viii: these men, after assuming office, thought it right to enrol other soldiers ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀποθανόντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ. The meaning of ὑπὲρ rather wavers in 1 Th 5^{10}: Christ died ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, 1 P 2^{21}, Christ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (al. ἡμῶν), for in both texts the meaning might be either 'for the sake of' or 'instead of'; perhaps both senses are implied. On the other hand in 2 Co 5^{14} εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν suggests the thought of *substitutionary sacrifice*. Hardly so in Ro 14^{15} your Christian brother ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν; there it might be possible to construe ὑπὲρ by 'for the benefit of,' though that notion is secondary.—See Trench, *Synonyms*, [7] 293.—In any case there should be no hesitation in claiming for ὑπέρ the signification of substitution and atonement, at least in certain Pauline passages. See a note in Sanday and Headlam's *Romans* (11^{15}); Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, vii. with the notes on p. 486 (ed. 13). The idea of substitutionary sacrifice is seen in 1 P 2^{24}.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

Winchester.

The Parable of the Sower.

MR. GRAYSTON is to be thanked for his note in your February issue on the value of the prophetic background in the interpretation of the parable: that the figure of the Sower was 'chosen by Jesus because it was a recognized metaphor for God's action in bringing about the New Age.' If Israel was to be 'sowed' by God in the world, then the parable implies the extension of God's purpose for the world at that period, *i.e.* a Gentile mission through Jewry.

Assuming the secondary character of the 'interpretation' as given in the Gospels, might I draw attention to the value of a passage which Mr. Grayston has, rather strangely, omitted? The importance of Is $55^{11f.}$ might be stressed for three reasons.

1. Its very great appositeness to a Spring time address (which we assume the parable to have been). This scripture proclaims a Spring time of God's purposes for the world, and tells of the prophetic word that does not go forth in vain.

2. There is some ground for thinking that this passage had a more *particular* appeal. What is needed to enable us to believe that this scripture is of first-rate importance, is some hint that it should have been associated in the mind of Jesus with some decisive occasion in the public ministry, so that for him the emotional significance of it was heightened. Such an occasion we might find in a new resolve to pursue at that time a course of action in independence of the synagogue and its authorities; in place of dependence to make a 'broadcast' appeal to the people. Some details of the parable might well find new point from this vantage ground.

3. Then what is to hinder us from believing that our Lord was affected by the approach of Spring? It would seem therefore that this passage and those cited by your correspondent might be complementary.

S. K. FINLAYSON.

Ollaberry, Shetland.

Entre Nous.

Spiritual Detectives.

I have just been reading with a great deal of interest the article by the Rev. Ronald W. Thomson in your December 1943 issue entitled *The Detective Novel and the Preacher.* It is full of suggestion and the writer is evidently familiar with both the detective story and the difficult and dangerous art of preaching.

May I suggest some further parallels between the detective and the preacher. The first is in the tracking down of the true meaning of the text, and that, at times, can be just as fascinating as the unravelling of any murder mystery. The detective goes to the scene of the crime, if possible, and tries to re-enact in his mind, from the evidence before him, just what took place. He tries to get inside the mind of the murderer. He tries to follow his thought processes as he attempts to conceal his motives and movements. The true preacher also tries to get back to originals. The writer of the Scripture passage is trying to *reveal* not conceal his thought, but much has come in between: the 'drifting years,' the various translators, or the orthodox interpretation, which may be wrong. The preacher attempts to trace the idea right back to the mind of the man who gave it birth. He tries to picture him in his setting and asks, 'What was *he* trying to say?' In the course of an interview with Dr. F. W. Norwood on 'preaching,' he said to me, 'I try to *visualize* the truth. If there is some Biblical scene I try what you might call the *pictorial approach.*'

Then, again, the minister, like the detective, must be ready to discard relentlessly any clue, however attractive, the moment it has been found to be false. Like the detective, he must try to develop a certain impersonal and impartial sense. He is on the side of reality, just as the detective is on the side of the Law. He is in search of *truth* and not just another sermon. He is willing to discard the original idea if it is found conclusively to be faulty in its exegesis or else he will find another text and track down its true meaning.

The preacher has one great advantage over the detective. The detective may be disappointed and find himself up against a blind alley or a blank wall. Most ministers can bear me out when I say that it is rarely so with the preacher. He may have to give up one clue only to pick up another. He may lose one preconceived idea only to make a thrilling discovery. He may emerge with a totally different sermon from the one he first had in mind, but it may be a much better one.

All good books on homiletics warn us to leave the mechanics of our sermon construction in the study and to bring only the finished product into the pulpit. Ninety-nine times out of a hundred that is excellent advice; but are there not rare occasions when we might well take the congregation into our confidence and share with them our search, our initial disappointment, our difficulty and finally our discovery? Some of the excitement of the 'find' would have to be in the mood of the sermon and it *would* be there if we came into the pulpit fresh from the mental effort. We would rethink it all in the pulpit and enthusiasm is usually infectious. What minister is there who has not left his study to share with his wife some exciting discovery in the Word of God, that involved some real research, a discovery more exciting than any detective story! To the uninitiated this may sound like an exaggeration, *but we preachers know!*

One other parallel I would suggest. It is found in the words of Charles H. Spurgeon: 'Every true preacher of the Gospel will be sure to become a spiritual detective.' Mr. Spurgeon certainly could qualify. It is said that on one occasion two men were talking in the porch of the Tabernacle as they waited for the doors to be opened. One said to the other solemnly: 'Ah, everyone has his own tale told here.' Mr. Spurgeon once said that every true preacher in the course of his ministry will, from time to time, speak as though 'he had entered into the very chambers of the hearts of his listeners and read the secrets of their souls.'

If it is true that the man in the pulpit should be a 'spiritual detective,' how much more is it true in the personal interview when the minister faces a soul in need. There he must get *behind*

the spoken word to the unspoken idea. His clues are made up of what is left unsaid as well as what is revealed. Some casual reference dropped in the course of the conversation may be the missing clue, which the person himself has long since lost, and that clue may have to be traced back through many years.

It was my privilege to hear Dr. John Sutherland Bonnell of Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, give a series of lectures to ministers on *Pastoral Psychiatry*. Among other things he told us that when people come to the minister for help they rarely disclose at the outset their real problem, but deep down in the sub-conscious mind there is the desperate hope that somehow the minister will discover their need and give them the answer. He reminded us that we must train ourselves to *listen*, always being on the alert for a word or phrase that may be a clue to a hidden problem and that we must not accept as final a man's own diagnosis of his problem.

With all due respect to Philo Vance, Lord Peter Wimsey and Hercule Poirot, the minister has a bigger problem on his hands. His evidences are often less tangible and he must know a good deal about what John Calvin has called the 'marvellous and extremely winding recesses in the hearts of men.' 'Spiritual detectives!' It is a good title. How many of us qualify?

M. A. J. WATERS.

Kharua, Central India.

The Message of Comfort.

In his book, *The Great Issue*, Dr. Sidney Berry has a brief note of much interest. He stresses the fact that one of the Church's great duties now is to give comfort to stricken souls. But comfort is not sympathy only. It is strength—strength to bear the load bravely. And this strength comes only from truth.

The truth which the Church has to give is twofold. First, that the cause for which so much sacrifice is given is worth the awful price paid. Unless there is a clear and conscious sense of the greatness of the issues, no comfort is possible. The most torturing of all doubts is that which lingers about the suggestion of futility.

But with the strongest conviction about the greatness of the cause for which life has been laid down, there remains the question as to what has happened to that life. And the answer the Church has to give is clear. It is that the life is not lost, that it has passed on to something greater, to a sphere in which God follows it and in which there is a career of usefulness. It is in the strength and greatness of that message that true comfort is to be found.

Chinese 'Face.'

Harold B. Rattenbury in *China, My China*, a book of outstanding interest, throws light on many aspects of Chinese character apt to perplex and irritate the foreigner. For thirty years he had been in close daily association with all sorts and conditions of Chinese. 'All my life there I had the healthy knowledge, for an Englishman, that there was a race that considered itself superior to mine, that I was a weird person with outlandish ways, hardly human, and of the stuff of which witches and wizards are made.'

To illustrate the many pitfalls in which Chinese 'face' may entrap the inexperienced, we quote one amusing incident. 'A Chinese doctor, left in charge of a mission hospital, went to the foreign superintendent and said he understood that funds were low and that the staff must be reduced (purely imaginary statements), but that whatever happened one man, "my colleague, Mr. Chang," must be kept. The superintendent pondered on this for some time and then went and sacked Mr. Chang. Afterwards the Chinese doctor was heard to say that the superintendent was the only foreigner who understood a Chinese when he spoke straight.'

Sunrise.

Mr. Frank C. Salisbury, C.V.O., LL.D., the eminent painter and artist, in his autobiography, *Portrait and Pageant*, records an incident that has nothing to do with art.

'Nineteen-forty, as we are all agreed,' he comments, 'was our year of supreme emotion, and none of us are likely to forget it. One of the hours I remember in it had nothing to do with the war. It was at one of the City Halls in London, where General Evangeline Booth was attending a farewell reception on her retirement. Lord Willingdon, who had lately returned from Delhi, paid a great tribute to the wonderful work of the Salvation Army among the outcast tribes of India. Lord Simon spoke of her great work, and the General herself made a most moving and eloquent speech. Never have I been among an audience more moved, or listened to a more eloquent peroration.

'The occasion was broadcast, and, turning to the Master of Ceremonies, she whispered, "How long have I got?" "Three minutes," he said, and she threw her notes away and proceeded to describe the passing of her father, whose face was turned towards the setting sun.

'She found him one evening in his study, weak and helpless. The window looked out across the open landscape, and there was a beautiful sunset. What a Turner she painted in words in one of those three minutes! High above the golden glow in the western sky were fleecy white clouds in trailing splendour like a choir of angels, and she called to her father and asked if he could see this glory. "No," he said, "I cannot see," so she held him up and led him nearer to the window. But it was in vain. "No, my dear," he said, "I cannot see the sunset, but I shall see the sunrise!"'

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.